



INDIAN EDITION

& M^o & Co.

Price 12 annas

75 paise

இயேசு கிறிஸ்துவின் நாமத்தில் அன்பின் வாழ்த்துக்கள்

ஏறக்குறைய 7 ஆண்டுகளாக பல இடங்களிலிருந்து சேகரித்த சுமார் 200 ஆண்டுகளுக்கு முன்பு வரை அச்சடிக்கப்பட்ட, ஆரோக்கிய உபதேசங்கள் அடங்கிய, கிறிஸ்தவ ஆவிக்குரிய புத்தகங்களை, பல மணி நேரம் கொடுத்து, பல இலட்சங்கள் செலவு செய்து மின் நூல்களாக (E-Books) இலவசமாக (மத்தேயு 10:8) உங்கள் கரங்களில் கொடுப்பதற்கு, அற்புதம் நீசருமான எங்களை பயன்படுத்தின உன்னத தேவனுக்கே சகல கனமும் மகிமையும் துதியும் உரித்தாவதாக. இதைப் போன்ற இன்னும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான புத்தகங்களை தரவிறக்கம் (Download) செய்ய எங்களுடைய இணையதளத்தை சொருக்கவும்/பார்க்கவும்: www.WordOfGod.in

95 சதவீத புத்தகங்கள் அச்சில் இல்லாதவைகளும், காப்புரிமை முடிந்தவைகளுமே. மீதமுள்ள புத்தகங்கள், நல்ல உபதேசங்களை கொண்டிருப்பதால், முடிந்தவரை ஆசிரியரின் உரிமையோடு மின்-நூலாக, இலவசமாக வெளியிடுகிறோம். ஒருவேளை உங்களுடைய புத்தகம் இப்படி இலவசமாக மின்-நூல் (E-Book) வடிவில் வரக்கூடாது என்று நினைத்தீர்களானால், தயவு செய்து எங்களை மன்னித்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள். எங்களுடைய WhatsApp எண்ணிற்கோ, மின் அஞ்சலிலோ (Email) எங்களுக்கு தெரியப்படுத்துங்கள். உடனடியாக எங்களுடைய இணைய-தளத்திலிருந்து எடுத்துவிடுகிறோம்.

WhatsApp/SMS: +91 90 190 490 70 / +91 7676 50 5599

Email: wordofgod@wordofgod.in

Wishing you in the mighty name of Jesus Christ

We had collected several thousands of old Tamil Spiritual Books which are rich in Sound Doctrines across various places of India for 7 years. Some of them are more than 200 years old books. We have spent millions of hours and money in scanning them and converting them to E-Books. The work is still in progress. These E-books are published completely free of cost (Matt 10:8) forever. We give all the praise and glory to God for giving this wonderful opportunity to serve Him. You can download thousands of similar Tamil Christian E-books from our website www.WordOfGod.in completely free of cost at any time.

95% of these E-Books are not being printed now and their copyrights are already expired. The remaining books are sent as E-Books mostly with the permission from the Authors. If you feel that your books should not be published as E-Book freely, kindly excuse and forgive us. Please let us know the book details by WhatsApp or Email we will remove them from our website.

WhatsApp/SMS: +91 90 190 490 70 / +91 7676 50 5599

Email: wordofgod@wordofgod.in

THE QUESTION BOX

BY
REV. BERTRAND L. CONWAY
of the Paulist Fathers, New York

INDIAN EDITION

BY
REV. PAUL DENT
of the Jesuit Fathers, Calcutta

WITH A FOREWORD BY
H. E. THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE TO THE EAST INDIES

3,000,000 Copies Sold of
ORIGINAL AMERICAN EDITIONS

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, LIMITED
CALCUTTA - BOMBAY - MADRAS - LONDON

1935

Imprimi potest :

J. FALLON, S.J.

Superior Regularis

Imprimatur :

J. FERNANDES

Vicarius Generalis

Calcuttae, die 16a Maii, 1935

Copyright

FIRST INDIAN EDITION, 1935

Printed by Quorban Khan, B.A. at the Model Litho & Printing Works
66-1A, Baitakhana Road, Calcutta

FOREWORD

*Joannes
Petrus*

An admirer of Renascent India has pointed out that its fundamental characteristic is the "nation's great new spiritual urge towards Truth and Justice" which underlies the endeavours of its social and religious leaders and reformers. Religion has always been an outstanding factor in Indian life. But the spirit of religious inquiry is spreading ever wider since contemporary circumstances have brought more and more to the attention of India's intelligentsia the Christian teachings and their bearing on Indian problems. Great Indian minds, from Ram Mohan Roy to Gandhi, have been influenced by Christian principles. But unfortunately their knowledge of Catholic Christianity was distorted by prejudices and misunderstandings derived from non-Catholic sources and favoured by the absence of a handy reference book giving the true answers to questions and objections connected with Catholic teachings. To supply such answers is the object of *The Question Box* which has rendered such immense apostolic services in other countries and which, no doubt, will also help many Indian inquirers who, meeting "Christ on the Indian Road" in the person of His Catholic missionaries and followers, wish to look into their arresting claim of possessing the Truth and Justice after which India is thirsting.

This book is the areopagus where India's Athenians, better disposed than those of old, may meet St. Paul's successors and inquire into our doctrine and its meaning. It is a book intended to help those who aspire to the faith (*intellectus quaerens fidem*); but it may also be used with profit by Catholics who hear objections they cannot readily solve (*fides quaerens intellectum*) or who wish to enlighten their non-Catholic friends on our Faith and Religion. The ample bibliography provides further facility to go deeper into any matter dealt with in *The Question Box* and makes the book a key to, and a summary of, a Catholic Encyclopedia.

May God bless this Indian edition and make it a beacon of light guiding India's élite to the Justice and Truth represented by the Catholic Church!

+ Leo T. Kierke, C.F.

Archbishop of Salamis

Apostolic Delegate to the East Indies.

Bangalore,
Feast of Pentecost, 1935.

INTRODUCTION

In the United States a group of Catholic Priests, known as the Paulists, specialize in lectures to non-Catholics. Such men are, of course, asked many questions about the Church, and as they make it a practice to record these questions, they found that by 1903 they had some 150,000 of them. In that year one of the Priests of this group, Fr. Bertrand L. Conway, selected 1,000 of the most frequently re-occurring of these questions, wrote out the answers, and published both in a book named *The Question Box*. This publication has often been reprinted and revised, with the result that so far over 3,000,000 copies have been sold. By special arrangement with Fr. Conway this special edition of *The Question Box*, based on the latest American edition, has been prepared for exclusive sale in India, Burma and Ceylon. The main features of this special edition are four: (1) the price is one-third as much as that of the American edition, (2) a number of questions of lesser moment have been omitted, (3) a number of questions have been combined or rewritten to suit Indian conditions, (4) there has been added an appendix of questions which experience shows are asked about Christianity by those who are not Christians.

One word of advice on how to use this book. Many questions—questions, that is, which represent intellectual difficulties rather than bids for information—would never be asked about the Catholic Church if the questioner grasped, whether he admit it or no, the Catholic position, the Catholic preamble to all difficulties. That preamble may be expressed briefly in the following manner. Supposing—when it comes to dealing with most people, but always being ready to give reason for the supposition—that God exists and can reveal truth to us, we lay down a five-fold foundation. (1) Reason and research prove the Bible to be a reliable historical document; this document tells us of Jesus Christ and (2) of His claiming to be and proving Himself to be God Incarnate; and of His (3) establishing a Church to continue His work; a Church which (4) He, as God, *guaranteed will infallibly teach what He taught*; (5) a Church which is the “the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church”, or (as it is ordinarily called) the Catholic Church. (Catholic is a word from the Greek that means “Universal”).

One who admits this preamble will, for instance, never have any “difficulties” over the devotions the Catholic Church

approves of to the Blessed Virgin, the denial of the cup to the laity in Holy Communion, or the supposed conflict between Science and Religion, etc. For such "difficulties" are, as it were, third or fourth storey difficulties on a foundation that, since it is a foundation and a *divinely guaranteed one*, cannot possibly have on its super-structure any difficulties that are really and objectively such. This statement will no doubt sound presumptuous to some, but let such read further on, and, whether they agree with us or not, they will assuredly agree that we are logical on our own foundation.

One who does not admit the five-point Catholic preamble above, should belabour us on it, and thus look for cracks in the foundation, rather than go up on the roof and search for loose tiles. Why object to the roofing when your real objection is that there cannot be any roof at all for the simple reason that there is no foundation!

The Editor of the Indian Edition of *The Question Box* wishes to express his gratitude to three of his fellow-Jesuits, Rev. Fathers Michael D. Lyons, Michel Ledrus, and Thomas Siqueira for their kind assistance. The three are characteristically *catholic* helpmates, the first being an American, the second a Belgian and the third an Indian.

CALCUTTA.

Easter Sunday, 21st April 1935.

PAUL DENT, S.J.

O God, Thou knowest my folly ;
And my sins are not hid from Thee.
Let not those who wait for Thee
Be brought to shame through me....
Let not those who seek Thee
Be made to blush because of me !

(Psalms, lxxviii. 6-7)

CONTENTS

SECTIONS	QUESTIONS	PAGES.
1. GOD, RELIGIONS, THE SOUL	1-19	1-22
2. RELIGION AND MIRACLES	20-25	23-26
3. OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST	26-33	26-40
4. THE BIBLE, TRADITION	34-50	40-52
5. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	51-77	52-82
6. THE POPE	78-87	82-89
7. PERSECUTION, INTOLERANCE	88-100	95-108
8. ORIGINAL SIN AND JUSTIFICATION	101-104	108-114
9. SACRAMENTS	105-163	114-166
10. SACRAMENTALS	164-166	166-168
11. THE VIRGIN MARY AND SAINTS	167-185	168-181
12. LIFE AFTER DEATH	186-197	181-193
13. PRAYER	198-200	193-196
14. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS	201-216	195-211
15. INDIAN APPENDIX	217-242	211-243
16. BIBLIOGRAPHY		245
17. INDEX		249

The Question Box

I. GOD, RELIGIONS, THE SOUL

1. Does God Exist ? What is God ? I want reasons.

Among the dozen or more proofs for *God's existence* we will briefly consider the famous five of St. Thomas Aquinas, taken from the consideration of the visible universe as viewed under five aspects. That is, from the consideration of moving (changing) things we ascend to the PRIME UNMOVED MOVER, from caused, produced things we rise to the PRIME UNCAUSED CAUSE, from contingent, non-necessary, perishable things we come to the NECESSARY BEING, from things endowed with more or less of perfection we conclude to the SUPREME PERFECTION, and from ordered and regulated things we deduce the existence of the SUPREME INTELLIGENCE ruling and ordering them.

The fifth argument—known as the teleological, or argument from design—we give first, as it is the most familiar. A watch or other time-piece tells us that there existed an intelligent watch-maker ; the vastly more complicated and wondrous world tells us that there existed a supremely intelligent World-maker. Or, to put it another way, a watch comes into existence either by accident or by design. Obviously not by the former, for the characteristic of accident is disorder, and of design, order. Throw springs and wheels and so on about at random as long as you will, and you have a confused mess of springs and wheels and so on ; but put them here and there by design, and you have a watch. But if a watch must have a designer, then for all the more reason must the world have had one. Nor is this conclusion avoided by saying that the world came into being by "the fortuitous concourse of atoms", for this nineteenth-century concourse of polysyllables merely meant "chance", merely meant that if atoms danced about at random long enough, then you would have things more fearfully wonderful than the best of watches, a butterfly's wing, a baby's hand, the giant squid, or a lotus flower. Again, those who spoke so glibly of atoms little dreamed how the twentieth century would find that they, too, are not simple, unordered, undesigned things, but highly intricate and wondrously designed. Another attempt to escape

the "either chance or design" argument is to point to and exaggerate the frequency of the existence in the world of useless, unnecessary, futile, unordered, evil things, and then to say that they indicate chance as their originator, and hence the originator of all other things. This objection returns in question No. 6. Here it is enough to say that if we saw in a dormitory nineteen beds that were made and one that was not, we might conclude that the bed-maker was negligent, but we could not conclude there was *no* bed-maker. The application is obvious.

The first four arguments may be summarized as follows :

In the visible universe are things characterized by their (i) being capable of change, (ii) being caused or effected, (iii) being contingent, capable of non-existence, cessation from existence, (iv) being endowed with more or less of perfection.

The reason for these four conditions can be found either (a) in the things themselves, or (b) in an indefinite, perhaps infinite, series of progenitors of the present things—something like a line of parents, grandparents, great grandparents, and so on without beginning—, or (c) in a Primal Being that ultimately is responsible for things of this visible universe having the four above characteristics. But (a) and (b) are ruled out by logic, therefore (c) alone remains, *and the existence of that Primal Being, God, is proved.*

As regards (a): That which is capable of change or motion may set itself moving, but ultimately its motion is given it by another, whether that other be bread or a bullock cart or whatever else. In other words, the ultimate explanation of it being a changing or moving thing is not in, but outside of, itself. Again, that which is caused or effected—as a baby is, or a banana or a bicycle—is not caused by itself. For if it were, it would have existed before it began to exist. In other words, the ultimate explanation of it being a caused thing is not in, but outside of, itself. Again, that which is contingent, which can come into and go out of existence, has to go outside of itself to explain why it, a non-necessary thing capable of non-existence, exists at all. In other words, the ultimate explanation of it being a contingent thing is not in, but outside of, itself. Finally, that which is limitedly perfect, which is, for instance, good, tall or swift, but not the best, tallest or swiftest, has not in and from itself the reason for its having just so much of perfection. It, too, has to go outside of itself to explain its limitedness, just as a brick has to go outside of itself, to the brick-maker, to explain why it has just so much of the perfections of length, breadth, etc., and not more.

The conclusion is that the moving, caused, contingent, limitedly perfect things of this universe are such as they are, not because they have made themselves such, but because another has. Is that other—and this brings us to (b)—also moving, caused, contingent, limitedly perfect? If so, the question recurs—what made it such?

And the question will keep recurring even though we go back for ever through an indefinite chain of moving, caused, contingent, limitedly perfect progenitors of the moving, caused, contingent, limitedly perfect things of to-day. For a chain is but the sum of its links, and in this matter each link is zero. That is to say, each one, as far as being the reason for its own existence is concerned, is just no reason at all, just zero. Add your zeros forever if you wish, the answer is forever zero.

But there *is* something. The visible world *exists*, unless, of course, you wish to be an absolute and universal sceptic and despairingly assert that the whole human race mistakenly and insanely thinks it exists, when, in fact, it does not—and the whole human race, too, (excepting yourself) does not exist. Such *solipsism*, as this despairing philosophy is called, has actually been believed in by a few individuals here and there, and at least one of them once complained to William James that he had never found any other person to agree with him! Leaving the solipsist out of the question, however, and recommending that he reason out how *he* came into existence, we return to the argument above. The visible world exists, and neither the visible world of to-day, nor its progenitor of yesterday, gives the ultimate reason for its existence. There is, then, only one such reason,—the visible world ultimately owes its existence to a PRIME UNMOVED MOVER, PRIME UNCAUSED CAUSE, NECESSARILY EXISTING BEING, SUPREME PERFECTION, GOD. *Thus God is proved to exist, but what is God?*

As Prime Unmoved Mover, God is (1) *IMMUTABLE*. The term implies nothing of stagnancy or inactivity. For the fact that God is Prime Unmoved Mover tells us that essentially, by the very force and meaning of His Being. He is Movement, Action! But also, as Prime Uncaused Cause and Supreme Perfection, He is (2) *INFINITE*, so great that there can be no greater, so great as to be Himself incapable of being greater. No increase, therefore, no decrease, no gain or loss of what He is, is possible to Him. For Him to act—re-read the second and third sentences in this paragraph—is to act in a way inconceivable to us, a way that we can describe only negatively,

by using the term immutable to denote that by acting He neither gains nor loses perfection.¹

Again, as Prime Uncaused Cause, God is (3) *ETERNAL*, uncaused, unborn, unbeginning. That He is eternal is also seen from the fact that He is the Necessary Being—*He who cannot not be*. Hence, clearly, He is not merely unbeginning, He is also unending.

Again, as Supreme Perfection, He is supremely endowed with the perfection of intelligence, or, since this expression is tantamount to saying that the Infinite *is made up of parts* and has this or that, we more correctly say that God is, (4) rather than has, *SUPREME INTELLIGENCE*. In consequence, He is also a (5) *PERSONAL BEING*, an intellectual substance possessing itself.² A further consequence is that He is (6) *SUPREME WILL* or *OMNIPOTENCE*. And as evil is imperfection, we also conclude that He is (8) *SUPREME GOOD* (the *summum bonum*) and (9) *SUPREME PROVIDENCE*. This last title declares that He is (a) capable—as regards both power and intelligence—and (b) willing to direct the entire world to a supremely fitting end. Reason thus justifies the Christian prayer given us by Our Lord Jesus Christ,—“Our Father...Hallowed be Thy name...Thy will be done...”

Being Prime Unmoved Mover, Prime Uncaused Cause, Necessary Being, Supreme Perfection, God is (9) *DISTINCT FROM THE WORLD*,—distinct as being different, distinct as being no part of its moving, caused, contingent, limitedly perfect being, and distinct inasmuch as such a world is no part of His Being. Pantheism is thus rejected by reason, and its theory of emanation is no explanation of how the world came to be. The true explanation is that it came into being through creation, that is, through God, (10) *THE CREATOR*, making it from nothing in

(1) Note how we seem to be at our best in describing God when we say not what He is, but what He is not—thus paralleling the ancient Indian philosophers in their *Neti Neti*, Not This! Not This!! This is called knowledge of God as acquired by the *way of negation*, that is, by the process of taking some quality of things of this visible world and denying it to God, denying, for instance, that He is finite, mutable, material, by asserting that He is *infinite, immutable, immaterial*. Other knowledge of God is gained by the *way of excellence*, by asserting of Him the superlative of excellent qualities found in the visible universe. Thus He is *omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent* (in all places by His essence, presence and power), etc.

(2) The fifth proof of St. Thomas given above—the argument from design—also concludes to God's being Supreme Intelligence, a Personal Being and Omnipotence.

the beginning of time¹. The meaning is not that nothing was taken and that it formed, as it were, the potter's clay out of which the Divine Potter fashioned and formed star dust and baby hands and all visible things, but that before the world existed, only God existed, and He made it neither out of Himself nor out of anything else. For, since He is infinite He has no parts—to that which has parts other parts may be added or subtracted, therefore only the finite has parts—, and hence He could not make the world out of Himself. Neither could He have made it out of anything else, for before it existed there was nothing except God. Undoubtedly this is mysterious, but the man who thinks he can *comprehend* God—can, as it were, know Him through and through—has need of reflecting on St. Augustine's story. That great philosopher of fifteen centuries ago had become a Catholic and was writing one of the world's greatest books on the nature of God. Pacing along the sea-shore one day, lost in thoughts of his next chapter, he perceived a little child busily emptying water into a hole in the sand. With childhood's *camaraderie* the little fellow told him he was trying to put the ocean into the hole. The philosopher immediately showed grave reasons why the attempt was foredoomed to failure. The child answered, "O man, it is easier to pour the sea into this hole than to fit God into the human mind!"

But a part of the sea *does* go into the hole, and though a part of God does not fit into the human mind—for He has no parts—, yet our minds can partially, haltingly, dimly comprehend Him. As St. Paul wrote at the end of his famous panegyric on charity, "We see now through a glass, darkly; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known." (I Cor. xiii. 12) St. Paul's "then" refers to heaven and the unveiled and beatific (happy-making) vision there of God as He is, the vision before which shadow and surmise arise and flee away, as the unresting soul of man finds at long last full fruition in knowing and loving with deathless knowledge and with

(1) It is not so sure that reason can *directly* prove that the world has not existed from eternity. It can prove, though, that, if it has, then this would not imply that it has existed or exists independently of God, without owing its existence to Him. *Indirectly*, reason proves that the world has not existed from eternity, but began to exist through creation at the beginning of time. The indirect proof involves the five foundations of Catholicism. Reason having assured itself of their validity reasonably accepts Catholicism's teachings that the world began at the beginning of time. Thus it *indirectly* proves it, and *directly* it is, at the least, able to advance the weightiest of arguments against the possibility of the world having eternally existed.

undying love Him of whom St. Augustine wrote so beautifully, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, O God, and our hearts are not at rest until they rest in Thee!"

2. Cannot a man be moral without believing in God? Is not virtue its own reward?

No, the only basis of morality is God, the infinitely Holy and Just Lawgiver, who has written His law in the hearts of men (Rom. ii. 15), and given them the light of reason to discover the moral law that He has revealed. "Morality," writes Liddon, "severed from religious motives, is like a branch cut from a tree; it may here and there, from accidental causes, retain its greenness for a while, but its chance of vigorous life is a very slender one. Nor is it possible to popularize a real morality, a morality that shall deal with motives as well as acts, without unveiling to the eye of the soul something more personal than an abstract law" (*Some Elements of Religion*, 18).

The unbelievers of our day have attempted in vain to frame theories of morality independent of religion. Is utility to be the basis of morality? Christianity indeed insists upon a special duty of benevolence to our fellowmen, and ever works for the general welfare, but reason affirms that the common good is not the SOLE and all-embracing end of man; he is not WHOLLY subject to society. Utilitarianism accounts for the modern paganism which would sterilize the unfit and feeble-minded, and improve the race by the eugenics of the stud-farm. Is pleasure the moral criterion? Then you urge people to taste the forbidden fruit and judge for themselves, thus making immorality and crime a necessary condition of virtue (Cronin, *The Science of Ethics*, 275-372). Is virtue its own reward? Experience proves that virtue often walks in poverty and rags, while vice drives by in a Rolls-Royce. Is the inner sanction of conscience sufficient? It may easily be deadened by the constant rejection of righteousness, and then it calls good evil and evil good. Are legal sanctions effective? They cannot touch one's inner motives and thoughts. Will public opinion be our guide? It is often most corrupt, and blames men for deeds of worth, while it praises the successful and wealthy scoundrel.

3. Is not religion an invention of priests or statesmen?

There is no record whatever in history of the invention of religion.

This objection puts the cart before the horse, for priests could not have existed before religion began. "It was religion, realized and felt, which called for their service" (Hettinger, *Natural Religion*, 68).

4. Is not religion to be traced to fear, which was aroused in man by witnessing the wonders of nature?

No, the earthquake, the tidal wave and the storm may have aroused in primitive man a purely natural fear, as they do to-day among the most highly civilized, but if the human soul were not already conscious of the existence of God, how could the idea of God be evolved by the mere contemplation of the phenomena of nature? De Maistre writes: "By calling God Lord, Master, Father, man shows that his idea of God is not the result of fear. It is also noticeable that music, dancing and the other arts have always been employed in divine worship, and so inseparable is the idea of rejoicing from that of a festival, that the word 'feast' is everywhere synonymous with a religious solemnity."

5. Why is it that a good God allows the wicked to prosper in this world, while the good are afflicted?

As a matter of fact, prosperity is not always the lot of the wicked, and misery always the portion of the good.

Happiness is not always to be measured by mere externals. The virtuous poor may be happy in the possession of the true faith, and appreciate keenly the consolations of religion, while the wicked rich often find life so empty and profitless that they kill themselves in despair.

But even if in many instances the wicked prosper and the good are afflicted, that fact merely proves the existence of the after-life, wherein an Infinitely Just and Loving God will right all the inequalities and injustices of this world. This life is a time of trial, during which a man must prove himself worthy of the eternal happiness that God metes out to those who serve Him. The sufferings of the good, therefore, are to be regarded as part of the punishment due to their sins, and as a great opportunity of merit, while the prosperity of the wicked is to be looked upon as their reward in this life. "Woe to you that are (wicked) rich," says Christ, "for you have your consolation" (Luke vi. 24). And St. Paul says: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come" (Rom. viii. 18).

6. Why did God make the world? Why is there evil in it?

Catholics believe that the world was made for the glory of God. A dogma clear on every page of the Bible (Ps. xviii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Eph. i. 56; Phil. i. 11). God is not only the Creator, but the Conserver of all things. Without His sustaining hand, everything would at once lapse into its original nothingness; "in Him we move, and live and are" (Acts xvii. 27). His Providence is all-embracing, not even a sparrow falling to the ground without Him (Matt. x. 29); it is infallible in all its workings, no secondary cause being able to thwart the divine plan. Once we believe in God's all-wise Providence, the problem of evil need not disturb us, for we know that God's ruling "reacheth from end to end mightily, and ordereth all things sweetly" (Wisd. viii. 1).

The Catholic Church does not pretend to give an adequate, but merely a partial solution to the problem of evil. She considers it a stupendous mystery which will be perfectly understood only in the world to come. In the name, however, of reason and of faith, she condemns absolutely the many false solutions advanced by alien philosophies and religions. She condemns the dualism of ancient Persia, which taught the existence of two equal principles, a good and a bad, continually combating each other; the fundamental pessimism of a Schopenhauer or a Von Hartmann, which declared the world too evil to be the product of a good God; the metaphysical optimism of a Leibnitz, which held that this evil-stained universe was the best of all absolutely possible worlds, and the arrogant will-to-power optimism of a Nietzsche, which denounced Christianity as a slave morality; the pagan Christian Science of Mrs. Eddy, which regarded all evil as an illusion of "mortal mind"; the inane view of Mr. Wells, whose "finite" god is supposed to lighten the burden of evil by sharing the evil he cannot altogether overcome.

Evil is not merely the absence of good, but of *due* good, "the deficiency of some good which ought to be present," as St. Thomas says (*Summa Theol.*, Ia IIæ, Q. xlix., art. 2, ad. 1). It is a privation, but at the same time something extremely real. Physical evils imply a defect which mars the natural integrity of a being, or interferes with the proper development of its activity. Moral evil, or sin, is a human thought, word or deed that goes counter to right reason and the law of God.

God, therefore, cannot be the cause of evil, for evil, being something privative, cannot be the term of a positive creative act. "Just as the sun in the heavens gives light, whilst the

shadow on the ground, the absence of light, is caused by the intervention of some obstacle, such as a tree, blocking out the rays of light; so the Infinitely Good God is the cause of nothing but goodness, the absence of goodness, wherever it occurs, being caused by the intervention of some creative object, not infrequently by the misuse of free will on the part of man" (Downey, *Divine Providence*, 62).

God certainly does not intend physical evils for their own sake, for an Infinitely Intelligent God cannot mistakenly apprehend evil as good and an Infinitely Good God cannot delight in the suffering of His creatures. He permits them only because in His divine plan they will further either the general good or man's good.

The true Christian does not dream of comprehending the divine plan, but he knows "that to them that love God, all things work together unto good" (Rom. viii. 28). Is suffering evil? The saints never thought so, for we find them always desirous of suffering, and welcoming it with joy. Sickness has taught many a man his utter dependence upon God, and has opened the heart of many a sinner to the consolations of religion. The blood of martyrs has been the fruitful seed of Christians, and the death of Christ upon the Cross won the salvation of the world. Suffering, too, is a constant reminder that "we have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come" (Heb. xiii. 14); "for that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation worketh for us above an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. iv. 17).

An Infinitely Good God necessarily loves His own goodness, and necessarily hates sin, which implies a deliberate refusal of a creature to obey his Creator and Lord. Our service is a free service: we are not automata or slaves. The freedom of the will that we possess necessarily involves the possibility of sin.

Will you insist that many men have no fair moral chance, because their bad stock, weak temperament, or evil environment seems to make their wickedness inevitable? This is simply untrue. God takes into account every possible factor that might palliate a man's guilt, and He gives to all sufficient grace to conquer sin in every temptation. No man is ever forced to sin. He must account at the judgment only for his free, deliberate evil deeds.

The dogma of Original Sin throws a white light upon the problem of evil. For by it Adam "lost for himself and for us the sanctity and justice received from God, and, defiled by the sin of disobedience, transmitted to all mankind death, the

sufferings of the body, and sin, the death of the soul" (Council of Trent, Sess. v., can. 2; *Cf.* Gen. iii. 16-29; Rom. v. 12-19). But as the Apostle says: "Where sin abounded, grace did more abound" (Rom. v. 20). Our Lord's death on the Cross freed us from the slavery of sin, and restored us to the supernatural order, but the preternatural gifts of Adam, which freed him from the dread of suffering and death, from ignorance and concupiscence, were forever lost. To Adam's representative sin, therefore, we may trace many present-day evils. Moreover, our Saviour made our ignorance, our concupiscence and our sufferings the occasion of supernatural satisfaction and merit. The supreme value of our spiritual struggle for heaven is, as Father Rickaby has pointed out (*In an Indian Abbey*, 245), the real purpose of God's permission of evil.

7. Did the Church once teach that woman has no soul?

Latin has two words for man, *homo*, meaning a human being, and *vir*, meaning a male human being. One of the Bishops at the Council of Macon, France (585), did not know this elementary fact, and, as St. Gregory of Tours wrote in his *Historia Francorum*, (viii. 20) "declared a woman could not be called a *homo*. But when the other Bishops had reasoned with him he held his peace", and, we hope, went out to study his grammar. On such a ridiculous basis the calumny has arisen that the Church once taught that woman has no soul.

8. What is the human soul? When is the human soul created? Have animals souls? Are not all souls identical? Is not the soul a part of God?

The soul is the ultimate principle of our individual conscious life, the principle by which we feel, think and will. It is a substantial principle, subsisting in itself, and thus distinct from an accident *e.g.*, colour, which is a mode or attribute of something else. The soul is a simple substance, *i. e.*, it is not composed of separate parts: it is also a spiritual substance,—its existence is independent of matter.

The character of the soul is known by its acts. That I am a substantial self is a fact of immediate experience. Father Maher says: "That I am a real being, subsisting in myself; that I am immediately aware of myself as the subject of sensations, feelings and thoughts, but not one of them or all of them; that I am the cause of my own volitions; that I am distinct from other beings; that there is in me a self—that I am an *Ego*

which is the centre and source of my acts and states, the ultimate ground and subject of my thoughts and affections, is forced upon me by constant, intimate, immediate self-experience, with the most irresistible evidence. If it be an illusion, there is no belief or cognition, however clear or certain, that can claim assent" (*Psychology*, 463).

The soul is a simple, spiritual substance possessing an activity absolutely alien and opposed to the nature of extended and material things. We are capable of forming abstract and universal ideas such as Truth, Goodness and Beauty; we can perceive the rational relations between ideas, making judgments and inferences, and conducting exact processes of inductive and deductive reasoning; we are capable of self-reflection, recognizing with ease the absolute identity of ourselves thinking about something, and ourselves reflecting upon that thinking self; we are possessed of free will, capable of self-determination, and untrammelled in our pursuit of truth, justice and righteousness. The spirituality of our thought, our volition and our self-consciousness is fundamentally opposed in kind to all the properties of things material and extended.

The human soul is directly created by God. God gives existence to the soul at the very moment when it is to be united to the body produced by generation, because it is designed by God to form with that body one human nature. The Council of Vienne, in 1311, defined that "the rational or intellectual soul is directly and essentially the form, *i.e.*, the life-giving principle, of the body." The divine origin of the soul is a most fundamental doctrine, which gives the lie direct to the theory of atheistic evolution, and invests paternal authority with a religious and sacred character.

The animal soul, on the contrary, is intrinsically and essentially dependent on matter. The animal is incapable of forming abstract ideas, and manifests no spiritual activity whatever. It possesses neither intellect nor free will. It is ruled entirely by instinct, and its activity is entirely limited to the sensible and the concrete. The animal soul, or principle of life is, therefore, incapable of life apart from the body, and perishes with it.

As regards the identity of all souls, first, animal souls, as not being spiritual and intelligent, are obviously not identical with human souls. But neither are human souls identical, that is, they are not one and the same soul occupying different human bodies. (1) Even those Indian thinkers who consider the human soul to be thus one and the same acknowledge that such a doctrine cannot be inferred from reason, but is a pure object

of *faith*, on a par with those teachings of Indian Philosophy which, like Karma and rebirth, Professor S. N. Das Gupta described in his Presidential Address in the Oriental Conference at Lahore, 1928, as "*unproven dogmas*" (*Modern Review*, Jan. 1929, pp. 6-15). (2) It is to be noted that in the Indian monistic speculation—as in that of Samkara—the so-called universal soul is a soul only through the effect of a basic illusion; in itself it is *not* a soul, but is rather a unique, absolutely simple and lifeless being.

(3) No rational—as distinguished from purely fideistic—argument can be brought against the psychological evidence of the distinctness of human souls, which distinctness is (4) also implicit in human responsibility. As examples illustrative of (3) and (4) consider, among others, these:—First, I am ignorant of Chinese, Chinamen are not so: have I not in this difference in our knowledge as much reason to regard my soul as different from the Chinaman's as I have in the difference of our skin, eyes, etc., to regard my body as different from his? And from mankind's agreeing with me on the *fact* of these differences, may I not reasonably conclude that it agrees with me on the *distinctness*, the *non-identity* of our souls as well as of our bodies? Obviously, I may. And I must, unless I wish to be placed behind bars, to pass my time in telling mankind that along with other inmates of the asylum I too consider it to be in the bulk and mass insane!

Secondly, this is not a confession, but I did not murder Lindbergh's baby, neither did I invent the wireless. Accordingly, I am immediately and unhesitatingly conscious of my being undeserving of blame or punishment in the one case and of praise or reward in the other. And further, the *sane* mass of mankind also agree with me, and thereby show that they too have psychological experience of the non-identity of human souls, in the same way as they have psychological and sensory experience of the non-identity of human bodies. In asserting that the sun goes round the earth, humanity shows itself to be *ignorant*, asserting something (1) that it does not immediately experience, on (2) mere outward evidence, that (3) could equally be (and is) evidence for the opposite conclusion—that the earth goes round the sun. But if it asserts that the soul in the assaulter and the assaulted, the saint and the libertine, the poet and the capitalist, is one and the same, humanity shows itself to be *insane*, drawing (1) from no rational grounds a conclusion that is (2) against (a) universal, (b) continual and (c) intimate human experience.

The question in regard to all souls being a part of God betrays a lack of understanding of what God is.

9. May not the freedom of the will be an illusion ?

Free will is the capability of self-determination; it is "that property in virtue of which a rational agent, when all the conditions required to elicit a volition are present, can either put forth or abstain from that volition" (Maher, *Psychology*, 395).

Free will is not "motiveless volition". It does not imply choice *without* motive, but choice *between* motives. It is not true that we always act on the strongest motive, for many men resist, time and time again, the onslaughts of a violent temptation.

The fact of free will we know by direct consciousness, just as we know our own identity. We are aware that we can freely guide our own thoughts, selecting, if we choose, the least attractive. We are aware that, when two alternative courses of action lie before us, we can freely deliberate upon their respective merits, reflecting, inquiring, and examining the reasons for each side. We are conscious that our final choice is free.

The moral consciousness of mankind points to the freedom of the will. The sense of moral obligation is written in every man's heart; it is as certain as the uniformity of nature. We know that we are bound to do right and to avoid wrong. We know also that we are absolutely free to avoid evil. Is it not unreasonable for the determinist to tell us that these solid convictions are mere illusions ?

Again, we always carefully distinguish between what we do inadvertently and what we do deliberately. No man feels any remorse or compunction for an action he could not possibly avoid. It cannot be imputed to him for either praise or blame. But if having committed a deliberate crime, he afterwards condemns it as sinful and blameworthy, he does so only because he is convinced that he acted freely and without compulsion. The determinist knows nothing of remorse or blame, for as James says, "He virtually defines the universe as a place in which what *ought* to be is impossible" (*The Will to Believe*, 61).

The idea of merit supposes free will. "When I have struggled against a difficult temptation, or made some deliberate sacrifice in the cause of virtue, I feel that my act is meritorious, that I have deserved a reward. I may see no prospect throughout my life of receiving the recompense. But I am none the less assured that I have established a right to it, and that such

a recompense is just. And this I judge to be so because I believe that act to be free....The good accomplished unwittingly, however useful, is not meritorious on the part of the agent; praise or esteem which I may receive for it, I recognize in my heart to be undeserved" (Maher, *Psychology*, 402).

Determinism is a pessimistic philosophy, destructive of morals and religion. Making man a mere automaton and a slave of his heredity or environment, it denies the essential notions of imputability and responsibility, and scorns the free homage of mind and will which we owe our Creator and Lord.

10. Can you prove the immortality of the soul from reason alone? Did the Jews believe in the immortality of the soul?

That the human soul will survive after death in the possession of an endless conscious existence, is one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. While it is true that temporal rewards and punishments from God figure largely in the Old Testament, the immortality of the soul is taught in its pages clearly and explicitly (Gen. ii. 7; Wisd. ii. 22, 23; Eccles. xii. 7; Prov. xv. 24; Isa. xxv. 10; li. 6; Dan. xii. 2).

The immortality of the soul can be proved from reason.
a. *Universal Belief*—"The notion of the survival of the spirit after death in some form, whether clear or vague, has ever existed in the human mind from the most primitive times to the present hour" (Henry Frank, *Modern Light on Immortality*, 35). Such a universal belief, influencing vitally a man's moral life, must needs be true, otherwise human reason would be utterly incapable of attaining any certain truth.

b. *The Nature of the Soul*—The very nature of the human soul proves its immortality. The fact that the mind can form abstract concepts, make intellectual judgments, draw logical inferences, and double back upon itself, proves that the soul is essentially independent of the body. It is a simple, indivisible, spiritual substance, that does not perish with the body, because it is by its very nature incorruptible. It cannot be annihilated by any human power, because creation and annihilation are correlative terms. Omnipotence alone can create and alone can annihilate. Reason tells us that God would not create an incorruptible nature merely to destroy it, and revelation confirms this postulate of reason. "And these shall go into everlasting punishment; but the just into life everlasting" (Matt. xxv. 46).

c. *The Nature of the Mind and Will*—Man's intellect can form the idea of endless duration, and transcend the boundaries

of the physical universe; it is not bounded by space or time. It has a natural affinity with the eternal realities which lie beyond all sensible experience. The intellect is never content with the truth it possesses, but is ever craving for a fuller possession of knowledge. Only the infinite Truth can satisfy it in the life to come. Man's will craves for a perfect, unending happiness which is unattainable in this life, because evil is ever present, and the good is never lasting. Nothing finite can satisfy man's aspirations, for he was made to possess the Eternal Goodness, God. If there is no life beyond the grave, this highest longing of man's soul is utterly without meaning.

d. *The Ethical Argument*—A Just and Holy Lawgiver would not impose His moral law upon mankind, without giving it an efficacious sanction in a future life. "If there be no future life, then the fundamental principles of morality are in irredeemable conflict with the just claims of reason; the fount of seeming law, order and finality is hopeless discord and senseless strife; the most imperious affirmation of our rational moral nature is one prolonged fraud; the ethical life of man, all that is highest and greatest in this world—that which alone is truly good—is a meaningless chaos. Intrinsic contradiction, absolute irrationality is the last answer both of science and philosophy" (Maher, *Psychology*, 542).

11. Could not man be moral and religious by obeying the dictates of his reason? What need is there of a divine revelation?

If you grant that God has created man for a *supernatural* destiny, you must admit that He has revealed that destiny to us, together with the means of attaining it. *But a divine revelation is morally necessary to observe even the precepts of the natural law*. The Church condemned Luther for teaching that, because of original sin, natural truth was beyond man's reach. Reason alone can prove the existence of God, the freedom of the will, and the immortality of the soul. But while some few may attain to a knowledge of natural moral and religious truth, the majority of mankind need revelation as a sure and certain guide.

12. What is your estimate of Theosophy?

Theosophy is a modern form of pantheism, borrowed from India, and popularized in the West since 1877 by Madame Blavatsky, Mrs. Annie Besant and Colonel Henry Olcott.

It rejects "the God of the Christians", *i.e.*, a Personal God, denies the fact of creation, and regards the universe as the mani-

festation of the Great Eternal Reality, or "the great rhythmic throbbing of the Unique All", whatever that may mean. The world consists of seven interpenetrating planes, and man, the Microcosm, of seven distinct parts, four physical and three spiritual. Personality consists of the physical body, the vital principle, the astral body and the animal soul; individuality, of the higher human mind, the spiritual soul and the spirit. The terminology of theosophy is grotesque and fanciful, like the terminology of the Gnostics in the first ages of Christianity.

As Martindale well says: "Theosophist theology 'depersonalizes' God without rendering Him more sublime, and drags Him down to matter without making Him more lovable. It exalts man's self to the divine, in spite of all his conscience tells him of his essential dependence and his sins; it preaches a spiritual series of necessary causes and effects, which makes the good and evil in him alike no concern of his, since it was not he who started the upward or downward series, however many be the intervening births" (*Theosophy*, 130).

13. In what way does Christian Science conflict with the teachings of the Catholic Church ?

Mrs. Eddy, its founder, pretended that her mind-cult was a revival of primitive Christianity, and gave it to the world as a new revelation from on high. Her teaching, however, is in no degree Christian, and its human origin has been clearly traced to Dr. Quimby, a New England mind-healer, whom Mrs. Eddy first met in 1862. She adopted as her own the two cardinal points of his system, *viz.*, that disease and human ills in general have no real existence, and that sickness is cured not by medicines, but by the influence of mind and prayer. Her book, *Science and Health*, which was published in 1875, also shows marked resemblances to the views held by W. F. Evans, whose book, *The Mental Cure*, first saw the light in 1869 (Georgine Milmine, *Life of Mary Baker Eddy*).

Despite Mrs. Eddy's denials, a pantheistic concept of the universe underlies all her teachings. God alone is mind, she argues, and alone has true existence. The world, plants, animals and men are simply His ideas, without any real activity of their own. Since God alone is real, all that is opposed to the Divine is unreal. God is spirit; God is good. Matter and evil are opposed to Him; therefore matter and evil have no existence. By such amazing logic Christian Science solves the two great problems of sin and suffering by simply declaring them nonexistent.

Christian Science denies every dogma of the Christian creed, while still claiming the Christian label. It denies the existence of a personal Creator, the divinity of Christ, the Redemption, the freedom of the will, the fact of original and actual sin, the existence of a divine teaching Church, the sacramental system, the necessity of faith, grace, prayer, asceticism, the resurrection of the body, angels, demons and the eternal sanction of rewards and punishments.

What are we to think of its cures? Those that are real may all be explained by natural causes. It is of course true "that a great many diseases can be wholly produced and completely cured by mental influence alone. Such diseases are purely functional. Other chronic and organic diseases cannot be produced by exclusive mental influences, neither can they be fully cured by unaided psychic power" (Dr. Sadler, *The Psychology of Faith and Fear*).

But Mrs. Eddy's claim that they are due to the direct action of God, in the sense that the Divine Mind is a negation of disease rather than a cause of cure, is simply an assertion without the slightest shadow of proof.

The miraculous cures of Christ recorded in the Gospels are not to be compared with the cures of the Christian Scientists. 1. Christ makes no distinction between curable and incurable diseases, but heals them all with equal facility. 2. No visible remedy is employed that could account for these cures. 3. The faith demanded by Christ was a faith in His own Divine mission, and not Mrs. Eddy's "understanding" of the unreality of disease. 4. The cures of Christ were instantaneous and lasting. They were of a nature easily observable by any and all interested enough to investigate.

Catholics are forbidden to go to Christian Science healers for treatment, because such action would necessarily imply a recognition of an anti-Christian cult, and encourage a false, superstitious method of health cure. The Church, while urging humble prayer to God, forbids her children to neglect the ordinary means at their disposal for the cure of disease,—medicines and the skill of doctor and surgeon,—as irrational and sinful. She cites with approval the words of Holy Writ: "Honour the physician for the need thou hast of him; for the Most High has created him. . . . The Most High has created medicines out of the earth, and a wise man shall not abhor them. . . . (Ecclus. xxviii. 1-10).

14. Is not one religion as good as another?

Is it not strange, that the very man who worries night and day over his business troubles, and who sacrifices health and

comfort in his pursuit of money, political preferment, or the interests of science, should at the same time be utterly indifferent to the truth of God ?

The God of indifferentism is not a God to be adored by rational men. God is Essential, Absolute and Eternal Truth ; He is likewise Essential, Absolute and Eternal Holiness. A God of Truth and Holiness, He cannot be equally pleased with truth and error, with good and evil. To assert, therefore, that God does not care what men believe, is indeed blasphemous. A man indifferent to truth—a liar, in other words,—cannot have the respect of his fellows. A God indifferent to truth could not demand the homage of thinking men.

The assertion that one religion is as good as another is irrational. It is a first principle of reason that two contradictory statements cannot both be true. If one is true, the other is undoubtedly false. Either there are many gods or one God ; either Jesus Christ is God or He is not ; Mohammed is either a prophet or not ; divorce is either allowed or prohibited by Christ ; the Eucharist is the living Jesus Christ or it is mere bread.

In the first three centuries the Christian martyrs died by the thousands rather than save their lives by a profession of indifferentism. Frequently they were asked by friends and kinsfolk to sacrifice to the gods of pagan Rome, or at least to allow their names to be written down as having sacrificed. "What difference does it make ?" asked their pagan friends. They answered in the words of Christ : "Every one, therefore, that shall confess Me before men, I will confess him before My Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father who is in heaven" (Matt. x. 32, 33). They were not indifferentists.

As a matter of fact, we find that the man who says first, "It does not make any difference what a man BELIEVES" is led logically to say, "It does not make any difference what a man DOES." His morality is built upon the shifting sands of opinion, fancy, human respect, and, therefore, will not stand the stress of sorrow, disgrace, difficulty or temptation. If religion be a mere matter of opinion, all certainty in morals becomes impossible, and men lapse into the old-time vices of paganism.

Sometimes the good lives of unbelievers are mentioned as proof positive that belief is an unimportant factor in the regulation of conduct. A man will argue, "A never puts his foot inside a church, nor does he accept any creed whatever ; yet he is a man, kindly, charitable, pure and honest. On the other hand, B is a Catholic, accepting without question every dogma and law of his

Church, and I know him to be a drunkard, an adulterer, a hypocrite, the most uncharitable and contemptible of men." But this statement proves nothing at all, because the comparison is made between the open, well-known vices of a sinful, hypocritical believer, and the obvious good deeds of an amiable unbeliever. The whole character of the two men is often not adequately known, and consequently is not weighed in a true balance.

Will you say that conduct is the one thing essential? You are right. But faith is the inspiration and support of right conduct. It is the very foundation stone of the supernatural life. A good man will accept God's word in its entirety, once he knows it. A good man is bound to search for the revelation of God, once he begins to doubt about the validity of his own ethical and religious convictions. It is just as much a sin to deny the known truth or to be indifferent in its search, as to commit murder or adultery. This is a principle which the modern world has forgotten, but it will have to come back to it. It is a truth that the Catholic Church is ever trying to drive home to every heart and mind.

15. Does not the Bible say that "God is no respecter of persons : But in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him"?

There is not the slightest trace of the dogma of indifferentism in this passage. St. Peter is insisting upon the universal character of the Church Catholic, and teaching that God excludes no one from His Messianic Kingdom, whether Jew or Gentile.

He does not imply that the Pagan is saved by his piety and his natural virtues, but that he is pleasing (*dektos*) to God, because he is well prepared to receive the grace of God, and thus enter His true Church, regardless not of his religion, but of his nationality.

In this same sermon, St. Peter tells his hearers of the necessity of faith and sorrow for sin (Acts x. 43), and he insists on their belief in Christ's divinity, miracles, death on the Cross, His Resurrection, His coming one day to judge mankind, His fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies (Acts x. 34-43).

Once Cornelius saw the truth of the Gospel he at once embraced it, and was received into the Church by St. Peter.

16. Why does the God of truth allow so many religions in the world ?

We readily admit that the existence of so many false religions is a great evil, difficult to explain. But because our finite minds cannot fully enter into the secrets of God, must we therefore deny His all-ruling Providence? "No," says Balme: "The evil exists,

it is true ; but that God's Providence also exists, is no less certain. Apparently these are two things which cannot co-exist ; but as you know for certain they do exist, this apparent contradiction is not sufficient to make you deny their existence. What you should do is to seek a means of removing this contradiction, and in case you cannot possibly discover one, attribute this impossibility to your own inability" (*Letters to a Sceptic*, ii., 24).

The only solution to the problem lies in the mystery of Original Sin, which weakened men's minds and wills, and left them subject to error and sin. St. Paul speaks of pagans who through personal sin "became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things" (Rom. i. 21-23).

The existence of many false religions should not cause a thinking man to be a sceptic or an agnostic. A counterfeit coin always points to a true original. There is always a way of telling the true coin from the false.

17. I cannot accept Christianity, because it compels me to believe incomprehensible mysteries.

Most of us have not the opportunity—to say nothing of the ability—to investigate the atom, or study the conditions of interstellar space, or learn by experiment the state of things at the north pole, or decipher the inscriptions of ancient Etruscan or Egyptian or Indus Valley civilizations. Hence we resign ourselves to accepting the findings of experts in these matters, and this, too, in spite of two objections to this manner of acting. (1) Our experts are, after all, human beings, and can err or deceive. (2) They often tell us things so mysterious that we cannot understand them. As honest Newton said, "I know the laws of attraction, but if you ask me what attraction is, I really cannot tell."

Our manner of acting when we rely on human experts is quite intelligible. But reasonable as it may be, it is less reasonable than relying on the DIVINE EXPERT, the guaranteed Church which God founded to teach us infallibly in matters of faith and morals. For the Church is an expert which cannot err or deceive. And this, too, not only when it teaches us things we can discover and understand for ourselves (existence of God, immortality of the soul), but also when it teaches us mysterious things which our reason would never have known or known certainly (the Real Presence, the Blessed Trinity).

You cannot accept the Catholic Church because it compels you to accept incomprehensible mysteries? Then do this. Take the expert's words for such things, because the expert, the Church, is an expert, and cannot err or deceive. And then put that intellect of yours to work on this expert's mysterious pronouncements, and try to find reasons why they are fitting, are more probable than not, are free from absurdity and contradictions. You will then be traversing that most fascinating of provinces over which the mind can roam, namely, theology, the justification of God's ways to man and that "reasonable service" which St. Paul desires our religion to be. (Rom. xii. 1).

But you do not believe this? You do not consider the Church to be the infallible expert I say it is? Then your real objection is not that the Church teaches a number of mysteries, but that it teaches at all. Settle this point first, and if you are sincere, you will accept its teachings when they surpass your understanding no less than when they are within your comprehension.

18. Is faith not a mere confidence or trust in the fidelity of God to His promises?

No, this false doctrine of Luther destroys the very essence of supernatural faith. Faith may be defined as a supernatural virtue which disposes the mind to assent freely, with certainty, and on the authority of God to all the truths He has revealed. It is essentially an intellectual act, as St. Paul teaches (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 5).

The assent of faith is directed by the will under the influence of divine grace. The will plays a most important part in the act of faith. St. Paul says that "with the heart, *i.e.*, a good will, we believe unto justice" (Rom. x. 10). Our Lord frequently attributed the unbelief of the Jews to their hardness of heart, and their obstinacy of will (Mark iii. 5; xvi. 13; Luke xxiv. 25). The act of faith is a meritorious act, for the Lord said: "He that believeth shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16). It must therefore be a free act of the will. A good will puts aside all passion, prejudice, and human respect. It resolutely faces the problems of religion, and does not cease its pursuit of the truth, because the road is beset with difficulties.

Many men fail to believe, not because of intellectual difficulties, but because the truth goes counter to their passions, imposes obligatory laws, demands of them great sacrifices, and puts definite limits to their independence.

Both intellect and will must receive a special grace from God, before a man can make an act of faith. For as our Lord

says : "No man can come to Me, except the Father who has sent Me, draw him" (John vi. 44). Or, as St. Paul puts it : "For by grace you are saved through faith for it is the gift of God" (Eph. ii. 8). The Vatican Council echoes this teaching when it declares : "No person can assent to the Gospel teaching with a view to attain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit" (Sess. iii., ch. 3. *On Faith*).

19. I cannot believe in an absurd contradiction in terms like the Trinity.

While we grant that the dogma of the Blessed Trinity is an absolute mystery, which unassisted reason could never discover, nor even recognize as possible, we deny that it involves any contradiction. A mere statement of the doctrine will make this clear.

In God there are three Persons in one Divine Essence, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, really distinct, equal and of one substance. The Father is Unbegotten, the Son Begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost Proceeds from the Father and the Son (2 *Council of Lyons*, 1274). All things in God are common to the three Persons, and are one and the same, except where there is the opposition of relation (*Decree of Eugenius IV for the Jacobites*). The divine activity is common to the Three Persons, who are the One Principle of all things. As the words *one* and *three* refer to two essentially different things, *NATURE* and *PERSON*, there can be no question of any contradiction of terms. Three persons who possess human nature are rightly called three men, because the human nature in each is not numerically the same ; the Three Persons who have the Divine Nature are not three gods, because the Divine Nature is numerically the same in each one of them. How this can be we can never comprehend. We accept this doctrine only because it has been revealed to us by God Himself.

The Trinity is clearly mentioned in the account of the Incarnation given by St. Luke (i. 32, 33), in St. Matthew's description of the Baptism of Christ (iii. 16, 17), in our Lord's discourse at the Last Supper (John xiv. 11, 16), and in His divine commission to the Apostles (Matt. xxviii. 19). It is set forth explicitly in the baptismal formula, which all critics acknowledge to be primitive, in the doxologies (doxe=glory), or divine praises to the Three Divine Persons which were known as early as the first century, and in all the early Fathers, especially of the third and fourth centuries in both East (St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Gregory of Nyssa) and West

(St. Hilary, St. Augustine), at a time when the doctrine was denied from every possible viewpoint.

II. RELIGION AND MIRACLES

20. How are miracles possible, when we know that the laws of nature are fixed and immutable ?

It is good at the outset to define our terms. What is a law of nature ? A uniform mode of acting which a natural agent observes under the same circumstances. Thus, fire will always burn, a broken bone will take some time to knit together, apple trees will bring forth apples, and "great oaks from little acorns grow".

What is a miracle ? An event that involves a change in this general order of things. It has been defined as "a sensible fact which is beyond the natural power of every created agency, and which manifests an immediate and extraordinary intervention of divine Omnipotence."

Although experience proves that nature generally works according to fixed unchangeable laws, these laws are not, like the laws of mathematics, intrinsically and absolutely necessary. Natural agents exercise a true causality. The reason why the effect is what it is, must be found in the properties of the agent. As free will does not enter into their activity, the same agent in the same circumstances will always act in the same way. But no created cause can act without the concurrence of God. God, the First Cause, can in His Omnipotence and Wisdom intervene in the action of these secondary causes. He does so in a particular case, so that men may be led to accept His divine revelation, or to acknowledge His divine power. Nature is what God orders.

When God works a miracle, our scientific knowledge is just as true as it was before. The fact that iron is heavier than water remains generally true, even if God once made an axehead to float (4 Kings vi. 5-7); fire will generally burn, even if God once preserved His three faithful followers in Nabuchodonosor's fiery furnace (Dan. iii. 24); the knitting together of a broken bone will generally take a long time, even if God once instantaneously cured it, as He did in the case of Pierre de Rudder, of Oostacker, Belgium, in 1875 (Bertrin, *Lourdes*, 164-184).

A miracle, therefore, is not a violation of nature's laws. God in certain rare instances simply intervenes to suspend their ordinary activities for some supernatural purpose.

21. Do not miracles argue a change in God ?

By no means. There can be no intrinsic change in God, as the Bible teaches: "I am the Lord and I change not" (Mal. iii. 6; Cf. James i. 17). God is an Eternal, Omnipotent, Omniscient Being; all actual creatures—past, present and future—together with all their actions and all the circumstances of their existence, were present to His mind from all eternity.

22. Are not miracles incompatible with the wisdom of God, introducing the notion of caprice and special legislation among God's laws of nature ?

No, once we recognize the distinction between the physical and moral orders. "Doubtless the laws of nature are the best laws possible with a view to God's physical government of the world. But it does not follow that for His moral government, that is, for the guidance of souls to their eternal destiny, no better plan can be followed than to allow the laws of nature to pursue their course unchecked" (Joyce, *The Question of Miracles*, 18).

23. May not miracles be due to certain unknown laws of nature ?

Some pseudo-miracles of healing, rashly attributed to God's miraculous power, may be explained on the supposition that some unknown law may have produced them. But we know enough of nature's laws to distinguish the real miracle from the counterfeit. We know to a certainty, for example, that blindness is not cured by spittle (Mark viii. 23); that leprosy is not cured by the touch of a hand (Matt. viii. 3); that the dead do not arise at the sound of a voice (John xi. 43); that five thousand people cannot be fed with five loaves and two fishes (Matt. xiv. 19).

The instantaneous character of many of the cures at Lourdes, which may be studied in the pages of Boissarie's *The Work of Lourdes*, Dr. Bertrin's *Lourdes*, and Grandmaison's *Twenty Cures at Lourdes*, is proof positive against the hypothesis of unknown natural laws. These sick people at Lourdes undergo no sanatorium treatment, but prayerfully and humbly ask God to work a cure through His Mother's intercession. The many cures effected cannot honestly be gainsaid by any man who carefully weighs the evidence.

24. If we take into account the general unreliability of human testimony, how can any particular miracle be certainly proved ?

We readily grant that some simple-minded souls, anxious for a cure, may be deceived regarding the supernatural character of

their healing. That is the reason why the *Bureau des Constatations* was established at Lourdes as early as 1867 to distinguish scientifically the true from the counterfeit miracle.

But as a miracle is a sensible fact, it can be known either by the testimony of the senses, or the testimony of reliable witnesses. The man in the street can testify as well as any scientist to the instantaneous cure of a leper (Luke xvii. 11), or of a man blind from birth (John ix. 1); to Christ walking upon the waters (Matt. xiv. 25), changing the water into wine (John ii. 1), or stilling the storm with a word (Matt. viii. 26).

25. All religions claim miracles, so what special proving power have the miracles of Christ and Christianity?

To claim is one thing, to prove is another—a distinction to be remembered and applied *in all cases of alleged miracles whether in the Catholic Church or in other religions*. If you wish to know how severely and critically the Catholic Church applies the distinction, read *The Legends of the Saints* by the learned Bollandist, Delehaye, or the “sceptical” articles by Fr. Thurston, S. J. in *The Month* (London).

Or consider these seven tests for miracles in the case of cures. We quote from an address by Dr. Thomas Colvin, K.S.C., at a meeting in November, 1934, of the Catholic Medical Guild in Glasgow. “(1) The cure must be instantaneous. A disease like tuberculosis might become quiescent under favourable conditions and active again under unfavorable conditions. Hence if the cure were not instantaneous but gradual, then the objection raised would be that it was due to the natural process of repair tissue. (2) The cure must be permanent. The factor of time was recognized in miracles at Lourdes, for the miraculées have to report themselves for at least a year, or often longer, after the alleged miracle. (3) The cure must be of a disease with objective signs as well as the symptoms of the patient. It must be seen, or felt, or heard by auscultation, or revealed by X-rays, or chemical analysis, by the physician or surgeon. (4) It must be a cure that cannot be explained by the natural process of healing inherent in every living tissue. (5) The alleged cure must have been examined immediately before and immediately after the cure has taken place by a physician or surgeon, or credible witness or witnesses. One of the objections raised against the famous Pierre de Rudder miracle, which was a large gaping wound in the miraculée’s leg for eight years (the result of a compound fracture) was that he had not been seen

for three months by a doctor prior to the instantaneous closure of his foul wound. (6) The cure must not be such that it could be paralleled by a similar cure where no question of miracle was raised. (7) In a cure of a nervous disease there must be objective evidence of an organic lesion so as to exclude purely functional diseases, such as 'hysteria'."

But suppose miracles are really proven in other religions? If such a case would happen, then the Catholic would see confirmed by fact something he holds in theory. That is, that God *can* work miracles in other religions, just as He *can* give grace in other religions. *But neither the working nor the giving will be such that He thereby confirms the other religions or any error in them.* Rather, He will confirm in other religions that which is really *Catholic*, really something true and pertaining to the Catholic religion, some resplendent pearl of Catholicism lost, as it were, in a dustbin of error. All religions have something of truth; the plenitude is in the Catholic Church. All religions tell us of God's existence, and this truth is a truth no matter how much obscured it be by encasing errors of polytheistic mythology. To show in a striking way this truth—or any other Catholic truth which has strayed away into the company of error—God *can* work a miracle in a non-Catholic religion.

For remarks on the fact that God *can* give grace in other religions, see under Sections 7 and 15.

III. OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

26. Your account of Christ depends on the four Gospels. How can we be sure to-day that they are genuine history?

According to a well-established tradition the three Synoptic Gospels (*i. e.*, written from a common point of view), were written between the years 50 and 70, and the Fourth Gospel between 80 and 100. The same tradition attributed them certainly to the publican Levi, that is, St. Matthew; to Mark, the disciple of St. Peter; to Luke, the physician and friend of St. Paul; to St. John, the Apostle, the son of Zebedee.

Modern rationalistic critics have denied this tradition, not in the name of history, but in the name of preconceived theories, which questioned the possibility of the supernatural and the miraculous. The utter failure of their attempt to undermine the genuineness of the Gospels may be studied in the best treatise we know on this subject, Felder's *Christ and the Critics*.

The arguments for their genuineness may thus be summarized :

1. The writers of the first three centuries were all acquainted with the four Gospels, cited them repeatedly, and took for granted their high place in the Church's teaching. We mention the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, the Epistle of Barnabas, St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Polycarp of Asia Minor, Papias of Hierapolis, Aristides of Athens, Justin Martyr of Rome, Tertullian of Africa, St. Irenæus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. These writers do not give us merely their personal opinion, but express clearly the faith of the universal Church.

2. The first enemies of Christianity—the Pagans, the Jews and heretics—although they ridiculed the contents and credibility of the Gospels, never dreamt of denying their genuineness, which would have been for them the best possible argument.

3. The apocryphal Gospels, which were everywhere denounced by the Church as non-apostolic, and spurious, fabulous and fantastic travesties of the true Gospels, prove the genuineness of the original four, as counterfeit coins prove the existence of the originals they imitate.

4. The Gospels themselves indicate in the clearest possible manner their Apostolic origin. Although our oldest manuscripts of the Bible date only from the fourth and fifth centuries, this is a comparatively old date, if we remember that manuscripts of the Latin and Greek classics, whose authenticity men commonly admit, date at best from the eighth and ninth centuries. The Gospels give us a perfect picture of Palestinian Judaism before the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. The political, religious and social life of the times is accurately depicted to the most minute details. Their intimate knowledge of the life and active ministry of Christ proves that they originated in the immediate circle of the Apostles and their disciples.

5. There was no likelihood of the Gospels undergoing any substantial change, because they were known and read in all the churches, and copies and versions were continually being made. The Christian Doctors of the first three centuries cited them frequently in their writings and sermons, and so convinced were they of their divine character that any change would have been instantly noted.

6. That the Gospels are true, reliable and credible is proved indirectly by the failure of the liberal critics of the past one hundred and fifty years to discredit them. Theory has followed theory—Reimarus' theory of deception, the natural explanation of Paulus, the mythical theory of Strauss, the tendency hypothesis

of Baur, the evolutionary hypothesis of Ritschl and Harnack—only go to prove that their authors read into the text their own *a priori* notions, and gave their readers merely the result of their imaginings, their prejudices, and their arbitrary and contradictory hypotheses.

27. What do Christians mean by the Incarnation ?

The mystery of the Incarnation is the unique and marvellous union of the Divine Nature and the Human Nature in the one Person of the Word Made Flesh, Christ Jesus. We call this union unique, because no other being is constituted in this way; and marvellous, because it is brought about only by God's Infinite Power and Love.

In the Incarnation the two Natures are united in one substantial whole, the divine Person Jesus Christ, as the body and soul, to use an analogy of the Athanasian Creed, are united in one substantial human person. Yet these two Natures remain strictly distinct; the lower does not in any way influence the higher, while the higher only influences the lower as it would do even if it were separated.

The mystery lies in the fact that the two Natures constitute one single Person, although they are not fused into one single Nature. The Word of God takes the place of the human personality, and makes the humanity so completely its own, that this Humanity belongs to the Word, and must be adored with Him and in Him.

It is true that the Bible does not contain the precise theological formula of "two Natures in one Person", but it expresses its identical meaning clearly in many a passage. The same Jesus Christ is Son of God and Son of Man, begotten of the Father from all eternity, and born of the Blessed Virgin in time. St. John, in the Prologue of his Gospel, states the doctrine with a clearness and a beauty never equalled, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God . . . And the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us" (John i. 1, 14).

St Paul often teaches that Christ is God and Man at the same time. He is "God's Son, who was made to Him of the seed of David, according to the flesh"; "God sent His own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh"; "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally"; "Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but emptied Himself taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men" (Rom. i. 3; viii. 3; Col. ii. 9; Phil. ii. 6, 7).

Although the Incarnation is indeed a transcendent mystery which never could be discovered by the unaided reason, it is not against reason. Reason can prove that Christ claimed equality with God, and that He confirmed His claim to be divine by miracles (John x. 25). Reason also can illustrate the Incarnation by comparisons and analogies. St. Augustine, for example, speaks of the intellectual concept, which clothes itself in a sense-form, speech, without losing anything of its spirituality. The Athanasian Creed lays stress upon the analogy of the union of soul and body. Moreover, our reason can appreciate the fittingness of the Incarnation, which so satisfies both God's desire to give Himself to us, and man's insatiable longing for the Infinite.

There is no change whatsoever in God. "God, in becoming Incarnate, loses nothing, receives nothing, is not in any way impoverished or enriched, but He terminates, completes and perfects the Human Nature. The change is in the Human Nature which is raised up to the Divine Being, not in the Person who raises it and renders it divine. The Eternal does not change on this account any more than the cupola of St. Peter's at Rome changes, when seen by the pilgrim for the first time. The change is entirely in the visitor; the monument remains the same, and there only happens to come into being a new reality, namely, the knowledge of the visitor which did not exist before" (Hugon, *The Mystery of the Incarnation*, 45).

28. Does the Old Testament tell of Jesus the Messiah ?

Yes, for over two thousand years the prophets of the Old Law declared that God had revealed to them the coming of Jesus, the Messiah, who was to be the Redeemer of the world.

God promises a Redeemer to Adam (Gen. iii. 15). He is to be of the stock of Sem (Gen. ix. 26), of Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18), of Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 4), of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 14; Num. xxiv. 17), of the tribe of Juda (Gen. xlix. 8-10; Cf. Heb. vii. 14), and of the family of David (Isa. ix. 7; Cf. Rom. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8).

Moses declares that He will be a great Prophet (Deut. xviii. 18), Isaias says that His coming will be preceded by a universal peace (Isa. ii. 4), and Malachias writes of His precursor (Mal. iii. 1). He is to be born of a Virgin (Isa. vii. 14), in the city of Bethlehem (Mich. v. 2), before the complete subjection of Israel, and the destruction of the second temple (Gen. xlix. 10; Dan. ix. 24-27).

The prophets continually style the Messiah the Lord (Ps. ii. 2), Jesus or the Saviour (Isa. ii. 5; Habac. iii. 8), the Mighty God (Isa. ix. 6), the Emmanuel, or God with us (Isa. vii. 14), the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace (Isa. ix. 6).

They tell us of His poverty (Ps. lxxxvi. 16), His obedience and meekness (Ps. xxxix. 9; cxix. 7), His public preaching (Isa. ix. 1, 2; Cf. Matt. iv. 15), His miracles (Isa. xxxv. 5, 6), His founding of an universal, eternal kingdom (Ps. xlv. 7, 8; Ps. ii. 7, 8).

They tell us that Christ will be a rock of scandal, and the occasion of ruin for many (Isa. vii. 14; Cf. Luke ii. 34), that He will be sold for thirty pieces of silver (Zach. xi. 12), led as a lamb to the slaughter (Isa. liii. 7), to be crucified (Zach. xiii. 6), while the people mock Him (Jer. xx. 7; Ps. xxi. 8; Cf. Matt. xxxvii. 40-42), the soldiers cast lots for His garments (Ps. xxi. 19; Cf. Matt. xxvii. 35), and offer Him vinegar to drink. (Ps. lxviii. 22; Cf. Matt. xxvii. 34). His sepulchre will be glorious (Isa. xi. 10). His body free from corruption (Ps. xv. 10), and He shall dwell at the right hand of God (Ps. xv. 11) to pour forever His Spirit upon all flesh (Joel ii. 28).

In the light of the New Testament these many prophecies prove that Christ was divine. Job identifies the Messiah with God: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth...and in my flesh I shall see my God" (Job xix. 25, 26). The Psalms, the sublime hymn book of Israel, declare that the Messiah is the Eternal God, whose reign shall be for everlasting: "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee" (Ps. ii. 7; Cf. Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5). "Thy throne is forever and ever...God, Thy God has anointed Thee" (Ps. xlv. 7, 8; Cf. Heb. i. 8). Jesus Christ was "The Expectation of Israel, the Saviour" as the prophet Jeremias foretold (xiv. 8), the "Consolation of Israel," so confidently awaited by the aged Simeon (Luke ii. 25).

Christ Himself always claimed to have fulfilled the prophecies. He said: "Search the Scriptures...the same are they that give testimony of Me" (John v. 39). Quoting Isaiah (lxi. 1) in the synagogue of Nazareth, He declared: "This day is fulfilled the Scriptures in your ears" (Luke iv. 21). When the woman of Samaria spoke of the Messiah to come, He said to her, "I am He who am speaking with thee" (John iv. 26). When the disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize Him as the Risen Christ He, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded to them in all the Scriptures, the things that were concerning Him" (Luke xxiv. 27).

29. Did Christ ever claim to be God in the synoptic gospels ? Was not the doctrine of the divinity of Christ borrowed by St. Paul from the pagan mystery religions, or the Jewish Apocalypses ?

Yes, Christ claims to be God on every page of St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. Mark. We readily admit that they do not teach the divinity of Christ in so marked and so direct a manner as St. John, for their main purpose was to prove that Jesus is the Christ, *i.e.*, the Messias, the descendant and antitype of David, the Expectation and the Hope of Israel. "Whatever deeds or sayings of Christ," says Father Otten, "were calculated to bring out that point clearly and distinctly were appropriately placed in the foreground, whilst His divine Personality received only such passing notice as was necessary to set forth the full sense of its Messianic character" (*What Think You of Christ ?*, 24).

In the Sermon on the Mount Christ identifies Himself with Jehovah of Sinai, speaking not like the prophets: "Thus saith the Lord," but as God Himself: "I say to you" (Matt. v. 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44). As God He declares Himself Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5), the Judge of all men (Matt. x. 32; xiii. 40-43; xvi. 27, 28; Mark viii. 38, 39; Luke xvii. 30; xxi. 27), the Pardoner of men's sins (Matt. ix. 2-7; Mark ii. 3-12; Luke v. 18-26), the Eternal Being "who dwelt from everlasting with His Father" (Matt. vii. 21; x. 34; xxi. 33-41; Mark xii. 1-9; Luke x. 18; xx. 8-16).

Christ, as the Son of God, claims to be equal with His Father in knowledge, and therefore in Nature. "No one knoweth the Son but the Father; neither doth anyone know the Father but the Son" (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22). He knows that God His Father knows our needs (Matt. vi. 32; Luke xii. 30); that He will answer our prayers (Matt. xxi. 22; Mark xi. 23); that a cup of cold water given in His name will be rewarded by Him (Matt. x. 42; Mark ix. 40); that He would, if asked, send legions of angels to succour Him (Matt. xxvi. 53).

Christ as God knows the innermost thoughts of men, whether they are absent or present (Matt. ix. 4; xii. 25; xvi. 17; Mark ii. 8; viii. 17; Luke vi. 8; ix. 47). The future is to Him like an open book, for He prophesies His betrayal by Judas and His denial by Peter (Matt. xxvi. 21; xxii. 34), His Passion, Death and Resurrection (Matt. xvi. 21; Mark ix. 20; Luke ix. 22), the destruction of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 35), the Last Judgment and the end of the world (Matt. xviii. 35; xxiv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.).

St. Luke frequently calls Christ "the Lord" (Luke vi. 21 & 46; i. 1; 22-44; x. 39; xvii. 5; xviii. 6; xix. 8; xxii. 31), and the Synoptic Gospels twenty-four times speak of Christ as the Son of God. God the Father proclaims Him from on high as His well-beloved Son, and sends the angel Gabriel to the virgin Mary, telling her that Jesus her Son "shall be the Son of the Most High". The Apostles acknowledge Christ as the Son of God, when He calms the storm on the Lake of Galilee, while St. Peter, taught by divine revelation, declared Him "the Son of the living God" at Caesarea Philippi (Matt. i. 29; iii. 17; xvi. 16; xvii. 5; xxviii. 24; Mark. i. 11; xv. 39; Luke iii. 22; ix. 25; xxiii. 47). When Christ is solemnly asked by the High Priest at His trial: "Art Thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed God?" Jesus answers plainly: "I am" (Mark xiv. 61, 62; Cf. Matt. xxvi. 63, 64; Luke xxii. 70), and for this claim He was condemned to death as a blasphemer (Mark xiv. 64).

The countless miracles (Matt. ix. 25; Mark vi. 55; Luke iv. 46) which Christ wrought in His own name and by His own power prove Him to be God. When the Jews questioned His testimony, He appealed to the miracles He had wrought as proof positive of His equality with Jehovah, whom He called His Father (Matt. x. 4; Cf. John v. 36; x. 38; xiv. 12). He stills the storm with a word (Matt. viii. 23-27; Mark iv. 39); He walks upon the surface of the Lake, and feeds five thousand men and women with a few loaves and fishes (Matt. xiv. 25, 16-21); He drives out demons from the possessed (Matt. viii. 16, 29; Mark i. 24; iii. 12; Luke iv. 34, 41; viii. 28); He cures the blind, the dumb, the paralytic and the leper (Matt. ix. 28, 32, 27; viii. 3), the servant of the centurion and the daughter of the woman of Canaan (Matt. viii. 53; xv. 28); He reveals His Divine Nature in the glory of the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1-9), and in the triumph of the Resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 6; Mark xvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 6).

The prophets of the Old and the saints of the New Law also perform miracles, but they always do so in the name of God and of Christ Jesus. Christ alone performs them of Himself: "I will, be thou made clean." "Do you believe that I can do this unto you?" (Matt. viii. 3; ix. 28; Cf. Luke vii. 14).

The unbelievers of our day have attempted to rewrite the life of Christ, without accepting His miracles. But as Liddon well says: "To expel miracles from the life of Jesus is to destroy the identity of the Christ of the Gospels; it is to substitute a new Christ for the Christ of Christendom.... These rationalistic commentators do not affect to take the history as it has come

down to us. As the Gospel narratives stand, they present a block of difficulties to humanitarian theories; and these difficulties can only be removed by mutilations of the narrative so wholesale and radical as to destroy their substantial interest, besides rendering the retention of the fragments which may be retained a purely arbitrary procedure . . . The moral integrity of our Lord's character is dependent, whether we will or not, upon the reality of His miracles" (*The Divinity of Christ*, 161, 163.)

Christ, the most unselfish and humble of men (Matt. ix. 30; xi. 29; xxvi. 39; Mark viii. 11; Luke viii. 51), demands and obtains absolute obedience from the Apostles (Matt. iv. 18; ix. 9; Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27), and insists upon love and service from His disciples even unto persecution and death. Father, mother, children, lands, monies—all are to be set at naught when He calls. "He that loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me." . . . "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that shall lose his life for Me shall find it" (Matt. x. 37, 39; Cf. xi. 28-30; xvi. 24, 25; Luke ix. 23-26). Only God could make such absolute demands upon our minds and hearts.

Many an unbeliever—Harnack, Hegel, Kant, Renan, Spinoza, Straus, Mill—has acknowledged the surpassing eminence of the character of Christ. He certainly claimed to be God. If His claim were false, He is not even a good man. As St. John says: "He that believeth not the Son maketh Him a liar" (John v. 10). But we know that He is "the One that is good, God" (Matt. xix. 17).

Catholic scholars have proved clearly that St. Paul did not derive his belief in Christ's divinity from either the pagan or the Jew (Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, ii., 115, 125; Bandus, *The Master Idea of St. Paul's Epistles*, 146-171). As he himself bears witness, he learned it from divine revelation. "I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For neither did I receive it of man nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12). He protested most strongly against the pagan deification of kings and emperors (1 Cor. viii. 4-6), saying—"There is no God but One.....One God the Father, and One Lord Jesus Christ." When, therefore, we find him giving to Christ the name and attributes of God, we must interpret him in the sense of Jewish monotheism, and in the light of the Christian revelation.

According to St. Paul, Christ is "the only Lord," identical with the Jehovah of the Jews (1 Cor. viii. 6; x. 4-9), "our great God and Saviour" (Titus ii. 13), "God exalted above all things"

(Rom. ix. 5). He is "God's own beloved Son" (Rom. viii. 3-32; 2 Cor. i. 19; Eph. i. 6; Col. i. 13), "the Image of the invisible Father" (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15), "who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (Phil. ii. 6). He is the Creator of all things visible and invisible (Col. i. 16). He is Eternal, "the first born of every creature" (Col. i. 15); Infinite "for in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally" (Col. ii. 9); Omnipotent, for "all things were created by Him and in Him" (Col. i. 16); Immeasurable, for "He fills all things" (Eph. iv. 10). The tribunal of God is His tribunal, the Gospel of God His Gospel, the Church of God His Church, the Kingdom of God His Kingdom (Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xvi. 16; Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. x. 32; Rom. xvi. 16; Eph. v. 5).

St. Paul's testimony is remarkable inasmuch as, before his conversion on the road to Damascus, he deemed it his duty to destroy the work and denounce the name of Jesus, whose divinity he was to proclaim so boldly. He began his public preaching within ten years of the Passion of our Lord, and wrote his first Epistles some twelve years later. "Neither the time which had elapsed, nor his Palestine associates, nor the circumstances of the death of Jesus were favourable to an apotheosis; and the seriousness of Jewish monotheism did not lend itself to the ridiculous deifications which placed a Claudius or a Tiberius in the ranks of the immortals" (Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, ii., 112).

30. Is there not a fundamental difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John? Is not St. John's Gospel more of a theological treatise than a sober history? Can you prove that St. John really wrote it?

No, there is no fundamental difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John. The only difference lies in the way the portrait of Christ is drawn. As Father Pope says: "In the Synoptic Gospels Christ's miracles and teaching speak for Him; in St. John, Christ speaks for Himself; the few miracles given serve as pegs on which hang Christ's discourses concerning His Nature and Person" (*The Godhead of Christ as Portrayed in the Gospels*, 22).

The differences in style and content are readily understood, once we realize the purpose St. John had in view. While the Synoptists, writing before the fall of Jerusalem, aimed at converting the Jews of the Holy Land and of the dispersion by showing that Jesus was the promised Messiah, St. John, writing thirty years after the destruction of the Temple, appealed

directly to the pagan world. He desired to correct the false notions current about the *Logos* among Greek thinkers, and to refute the Gnostic and Docetic denials of Christ, the Son of God (John xx. 31).

Unbelieving critics lay great stress upon the differences between the Synoptic Gospels and St. John. But they fail to stress the facts they both record. In both, Christ claims to be the Son of God (Mark xiv. 61, 62; John iii. 16-18; v. 18); in both, Christ shows an intimate knowledge of the Father's mind and will (Matt. xi. 25; xii. 50; John viii. 55); in both, Christ claims pre-existence (Luke v. 13; John viii. 23); in both, Christ is the Judge on the Last Day (Matt. x. 32; Mark viii. 38; Luke xvii. 30; John v. 27); in both, Christ is the Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5; John v. 17); in both, Christ forgives sin and delegates this power to His Apostles (Matt. ix. 5; xvi. 19; John viii. 11; xx. 23); in both, Christ knows intimately the thoughts of men, and the future (Matt. xxiii. 36; xxvi. 13; John i. 48; ii. 24; vi. 71); in both, Christ demands love and service even unto death (Matt. x. 37-39; xi. 23-30; John xv. 12-21); in both, Christ's disciples are slow to believe in Him (Mark xvi. 14; John vii. 5; xx. 9).

St. John begins his Gospel, not as St. Matthew and St. Luke with Christ's genealogy according to the flesh, but with Christ's Eternal Generation. His sublime Prologue states with marvellous accuracy and clearness the doctrine of the Incarnation. He declares that Christ the Word was from all eternity distinct in Person from the Father, but identical with Him in Nature. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." Christ is the Creator of the universe, "All things were made by Him." He is the fullness of Truth and Holiness, and the origin of all intellectual and moral truth. "In Him was life, and the Life was the Light of men." He was not only true God but true Man, assuming our human nature and making it His very own. "The Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us." John had been an eyewitness of the glory of Christ's divinity on Mount Thabor and after the Resurrection. "We saw His glory, the glory as it were, of the Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i. 1-14).

The Gospel of St. John is not a theological treatise, but a sober history, detailing every word and deed of Christ which prove His equality with His Father, Jehovah, whom the Jews adored. They stone Him for blasphemy (Lev. xxiv. 16) because He claims to be Lord of the Sabbath, saying "God was His Father

and making Himself equal to God" (John v. 18). Again they stone Him, because He, "The Beginning, who had glory with the Father before the world was made" (John viii. 25 ; xvii. 5), says to them: "Before Abraham was made, I am" (John viii. 53). The idea of God as the Eternal, Self-Existent Being, the "I am who am" was familiar to the Jews (Exod. iii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 2; Jer. i. 6; Prov. viii. 25). A third time they stone Him, because He asserts His identity of Nature with the Father. "I and the Father are One" (John x. 20). "They called Him a blasphemer, because He made Himself God" (John x. 22, 23; Cf. Matt. xxvi. 65; Mark xiv. 64; Luke xxii. 71).

In many another passage Christ claims to be of one Nature with God, His Father. "The Father is in Me, and I in the Father." "If you had known Me, you would without doubt have known My Father also." "He that seeth Me, seeth the Father also." "He who is of God, He hath seen the Father" (John x. 38; xiv. 7, 9, vi. 46). Like God Christ alone claims to be absolutely sinless. "I always do the things that please Him." And He confidently challenges His enemies: "Which of you shall convict Me of sin?" (John viii. 29, 46).

A careful study of the Fourth Gospel shows that it was written by an eyewitness, a Jew who had personally known Palestine in the time of Christ, a disciple whom Jesus specially loved (John i. 14; xx. 24; 1 John i. 1). That this disciple was St. John, the son of Zebedee, who wrote the Fourth Gospel at Ephesus about the year 100, was universally known and undisputed by the end of the second century. Is it reasonable to suppose the whole Christian world was mistaken about so important a fact?

31. Does not Christ's cry of despair on the Cross prove that He was merely a man: "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me"?

By no means. These words of Christ, quoted from the twenty-first Psalm, do not in any way express despair. The Psalmist does not imply that our Lord has lost the favour of God, but that God has abandoned Him to the hatred of His enemies. Christ makes His complaint with a complete trust in God, prays earnestly for deliverance, and ends with joyful words of praise and thanksgiving. If the Psalm is Davidic, it is also evidently Messianic, as we discover by comparing v. 9 with Matt. xxvii. 43; Luke xxxiii. 35; v. 16 with John xix. 28, 29; v. 18 with Matt. xxvii. 36; v. 19 with Matt. xxvii. 35; John xix. 24; v. 23 with Heb. ii. 11, 12. In the first part (vv. 1-22) the prophet speaks of Christ's

utter loneliness on the Cross ; in the second (vv. 23-32) he speaks of the fulfillment of Christ's prayer : the winning of the nations through His Passion and Death.

The four Gospels clearly show that this false idea of despair is read thoughtlessly or maliciously into the text. Christ is always represented full of confidence in God, rebuking His disciples for their lack of faith (Matt. xxvi. 53 ; Mark iv. 40 ; Luke viii. 25) ; the night before He died He had told them "to have confidence, I have overcome the world" (John xvi. 33). On the Cross He had promised Paradise to the penitent thief (Luke xxiii. 43), and He had lovingly committed His soul to His heavenly Father (Luke xxiii. 46). He had freely accepted the chalice His Father gave Him to drink (Luke xxii. 42). "He was offered because it was His own will" (Isa. liii. 7).

Some well-meaning but unscholarly preachers of the Gospel have suggested that Christ allowed Himself to experience the torments of hell, as if He were alienated for a time from His Father. Such a view is utterly alien to Catholic teaching. Our Saviour, it is true, endured on the Cross a mental agony in contemplating the sins of men which far exceeded His physical sufferings, but He knew that He was God's beloved Son, and He always enjoyed to the full the vision of His heavenly Father. The guilt of actual sin cannot be transferred from one soul to another. To assert that the guilt of men's sins were transferred to our Lord dying on the Cross is absurd and blasphemous.

32. Does not the Atonement mean that Christ by His preaching and His example delivered men from sin ?

It does not. Our Lord, indeed, did a great work for mankind by His preaching and example, but the Catholic doctrine of the Atonement means something altogether different.

Christ merited our salvation by His death upon the Cross, willingly, freely and humbly accepted in obedience to the will of His heavenly Father, and out of love for us (Phil. ii. 6-9 ; 1 Cor. xv. 3 ; Gal. i. 4 ; i. 20 ; Eph. v. 25). He took upon Himself the debt of our sins, and made satisfaction for them to God (2 Cor. v. 21 ; Gal. iii. 13). He redeemed us, purchasing our freedom from the captivity of sin, and repurchasing for us the liberty of the children of God (Heb. ix. 15 ; 1 Titus ii. 6 ; ii. 14 ; Gal. iv. 31 ; v. 13).

The Catholic doctrine of the Redemption is defined briefly by the Council of Ephesus (Anath. x.) in 431 and by the Eleventh Council of Toledo in 675, which speaks of "the Sacrifice of Christ as a sin offering." Pope Eugenius IV, in 1441, (*Decretum pro*

Jacobitis) declares that "the merit of the Mediator, Jesus Christ, God and Man, cancelled sin and opened heaven." The Council of Trent defined that "by the merit of the One Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, Original Sin is taken away" (Sess. v., can. 3); and that "the meriting cause of our justification is our Lord Jesus Christ, who made satisfaction for us on the Cross to God the Father" (Sess. vi., ch. 7).

The doctrine of the Redemption is clearly taught in the Gospels, and especially in the writings of St. Paul. At the very beginning of St. Matthew we learn that the name of Jesus is symbolic of His mission of Redemption—"for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). Christ Himself certainly foresaw His death, and accepted it as an essential part of His divine mission (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 21; xx. 17; xx. 22; Mark viii. 31; ix. 11, 30; xiv. 34; Luke ix. 22, 44; xii. 32; xvii. 25). More than once He tells us that His death will avail for the salvation of mankind: "The Son of Man is come to give His life a Redemption for many" (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45); "This is My Blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20).

In St. John's Gospel Christ sums up in a few words the whole mystery of salvation. "God so loved the world as to give His Only Begotten Son" (John iii. 16). His life of suffering and death is gladly accepted as a commandment from His Father (John xiv. 31). He is troubled at the thought of death (John xii. 27), but freely accepts it out of love for us (John x. 17; xiv. 31; xviii. 11). The Good Shepherd dies that His sheep might live (John x. 10-15), and promises that on the Cross "He will draw all men to Himself" (John xii. 32).

Christ Himself was the first to connect our salvation with His own death, and the whole mystery of the Redemption lies in the fact that He willed to give His life for us and for our sins. St. Paul explains the doctrine more in detail, by using the ideas of ransom (Eph. i. 7; Col i. 14; Cf. 1 Peter i. 1, 2, 18, 19; Apoc. v. 4), sacrifice (Eph. v. 2; Heb. ix. 14-26; x. 10), reconciliation (Col. i. 20; Eph. ii. 13-15; Rom. v. 10), and vicarious satisfaction (2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 13). "In whom we have Redemption through His blood". "As God has loved us and hath delivered Himself for us"; "how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered Himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works"; "we are sanctified by the oblation of the Body of Jesus Christ once"; "through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, making peace through the

The term apocryphal with us means writings falsely attributed to the Prophets of the Old Law or the Apostles of the New, whose claim to inspiration was rejected, or at least ignored by the Church. Such for example were the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the proto-Evangel of St. James, the Acts of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Letter of Christ to Abgar, etc.

35. What do Catholics mean when they say the Bible is inspired ?

The true meaning of the inspiration of the Bible is that God is the Author of all the seventy-three books of the Old and New Testament. The Vatican Council (Sess. iii.), after declaring that God's revelation to man is contained in the Bible and tradition, and that the canon or list of the Sacred Scriptures is complete in the authentic Latin Vulgate translation, plainly teaches the Catholic doctrine of inspiration. It says: "The Church holds these books as sacred and canonical, not because, composed by merely human industry, they were thereupon approved by her authority; nor alone because they contain revelation without error; but because, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they HAVE GOD FOR THEIR AUTHOR and as such were delivered to the Church herself."

Mere approval of a book by the Church, absolute inerrancy in its content, or the fact that it contains revelation, do not make that book inspired. It must have God for its Author.

Pope Leo XIII thus explains this divine authorship in his Encyclical on the Bible, *Providentissimus Deus*. He writes: "God by His supernatural power in such a way incited and moved them (the sacred writers) to write, in such a way assisted them in writing, that they should rightly conceive in the mind, and should wish to write faithfully, and should express fitly with infallible truth, all those things and only those things which He Himself should order; otherwise He would not Himself be the Author of all Sacred Scripture."

36. Are the inspired writers conscious of their inspiration ?

They need not know the fact of their inspiration, nor do they need in every instance a direct revelation from God. We know that the author of the Second Book of Machabees abridged the five books of Jason of Cyrene (2 Mac. ii. 27), and that St. Luke consulted documents and gathered his facts from "eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word" (i. 1, 2). Their literary style and wording may be their own (2 Mac. xv. 39, 40), so that

we often find verbal differences among them (Matt. x. 3; Luke vi. 29; Matt. xxvi. 26; Luke xxii. 19; Mark xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xi. 23). God may inspire the very words they use, but this is not essential to the notion of inspiration. We may hold, for example, that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, but we are not bound to believe, as the Biblical Commission tells us, that Moses wrote or dictated everything himself. Writing under divine inspiration himself, he may have "committed it to one or more to write, yet in such a way that they should faithfully express his meaning, write nothing or omit nothing against his will, and that the work...approved by Moses, the chief inspired author, should be published in his name."

37. How can one be absolutely sure what books constitute the content of the inspired Bible ?

The criterion or test that will enable us to make an act of divine faith in the inspired Bible must be infallibly true, universally applicable, and universally adapted to the minds of all men. "As the inspiration of the sacred books," writes Father Gigot, "is a divine operation, not necessarily known even to the mind that is acted upon by the Holy Spirit, it necessarily follows that the testimony of God Himself is required to make men perfectly sure of its existence; but this divine testimony comes to their knowledge, and is the absolute ground of their faith, only by the voice of that infallible and living Church, which He has commanded us to hear" (*Biblical Lectures*, 368).

Catholics believe that the divine testimony regarding the inspiration of the Bible was revealed by God to the Church in the days of the Apostles; that it has been preserved always from error by the promises of Christ; that it has been handed down to us, not merely by human tradition, but by the divine tradition of the Catholic Church, which alone can infallibly interpret it.

38. Do Catholics regard the Bible as absolutely inerrant ?

Yes, it is an article of faith that the Bible is inerrant, *i. e.*, it contains no formal error. As God is the Author of the Bible it must needs be true. "Inspiration," says Pope Leo, "not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily, for it is impossible that God, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. This is the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church" (*Encyc. Providentissimus Deus*).

We cannot restrict inspiration to certain parts only.

We cannot restrict inspiration to faith and morals alone.

We do not look for precise scientific formulas in the Bible, for it does not teach science *ex professo*. Nothing in its pages contradicts the teachings of natural science, because the same God is the author of natural and supernatural truth. But the sacred writers generally speak of scientific matters in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time they wrote.

May Catholics hold the theory of "implicit quotations," *i.e.*, may they set aside a certain passage on the supposition that the sacred writer is merely copying what he finds in some historical record, without thereby guaranteeing its veracity? Yes, says the Biblical Commission (February 13, 1905), if solid reasons exist for believing that there really is a quotation, and that the sacred writer does not really intend to commit himself to what he quotes.

We must remember that the Bible on its material side is a human document handed down to us in a human way. Therefore we naturally expect to find in each succeeding copy or version material variations, additions, omissions and other errors with which critical scholarship has to grapple. St. Augustine mentions this in a letter to St. Jerome: "When in the pages of Sacred Writ I come upon anything that is contrary to the truth, I judge that the text is faulty, that the translator did not strike the right meaning, or simply that I do not understand it" (*Letter to St. Jerome*, lxxxii., 3).

The poetic imagery and symbolism in both the Old and New Testament, in the Prophets, the Psalms, the Apocalypse, is to be understood figuratively. But "this exuberant symbolism must not be conceived as supplanting reality, but as supporting it, as bringing out its full reality, not so much to our prosaic selves, as to the Orientals for whom so much of it was primarily written" (*The Bible, Its History*, 159).

39. How could the Council of Trent (1546) declare the Vulgate "authentic," when we know it contains many mistakes?

The original Scriptures were not even mentioned in the disciplinary decree, *Insuper*, of the Council of Trent, and the Fathers expressly stated that "it was not meant to detract from the authority due to the true and pure translation of the Septuagint." The authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles remained exactly the same as it was before, and Catholic scholars were allowed perfect liberty to use them to arrive at the genuine meaning of the Latin version.

In declaring the Vulgate "authentic," *i. e.*, officially guaranteed, the Council did not imply that it was in every respect an absolutely accurate rendering of the original text, but that it was free from error in faith and morals and was substantially faithful to the original Scriptures. Henceforth it was to be the Church's official text in all "public conferences, disputations, sermons, and expositions." The Decree referred to the Vulgate as it left the hands of St. Jerome, and the bishops, fully aware of the many faulty current copies, ordered a revision of the text to be made. The first revision was completed by Sixtus V in 1590, to be corrected again by Clement VIII in 1592.

A third is now in process, having been begun in 1910. But so involved are the questions of scholarship that so far (1929) only three books have been completed, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus.

40. Is the history of creation in the first chapters of Genesis scientific history ?

No, a careful examination of the account of creation in Genesis shows that it is given in a more or less poetical form, expressed in popular not scientific language. Although descriptive of a definite series of operations, it teaches us nothing but the fact that God created all things and rested upon the Sabbath day. As the Church has never made any definite pronouncement regarding the various theories held by Catholic scholars, Catholics are perfectly free to adopt any theory that does not deny the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis. (*Decision of the Biblical Commission*, June 30, 1909). While, as St. Thomas says, "it is part of the substance of the faith that the world began by creation . . . in what manner and order it was made . . . our holy men have expounded in many ways" (*In II. Sent.*, xii., 9, art. 11).

The Literal view, commonly held by the Fathers and the Schoolmen, interprets the six days as literal days of twenty-four hours each. This general consensus has no binding dogmatic force, because it has against it the authority of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas.

The Concordist theory regards the six days as indefinite periods of time, and aims to reconcile Genesis with the data of science by way of concordance. Although this view has had many supporters it is rejected by many Catholic scholars, because it is not founded upon the analogy of faith, and tends to make religion subordinate to the ever varying and contradictory hypotheses of science. Is it honest to read into a popular account the scientific opinions of centuries to come ?

The Poetic theory declares that the first chapter of Genesis

was probably nothing more than a ritual hymn, consecrating each day of the week to a particular creative act of God.

The Vision theory maintains that God showed Adam in a series of visions the general dependence of everything upon His creative power.

The Allegory theory of St. Augustine holds that the only answer to every difficulty is to see in Genesis the history of the origin of the world and of man described in metaphorical form—a view that does not weaken the historical character of the narrative, but assumes it.

St. Augustine gives his readers some very sensible words of advice, when discussing this very question. He writes: "In things that are obscure and remote from sight, if we read anything even in Scripture which, with safety to our faith, can bear different meanings, let us not by precipitate assertion so throw ourselves into any one interpretation, as to be ruined in case a fuller investigation of the truth should overthrow our view. This would be to fight, not for the meaning of Holy Scripture but for our own meaning" (*De Gen ad Lit.*, i., 37).

41. Does not modern science show the falsity of the Bible's chronology with regard to the age of man ?

It does not, because it has not yet solved the problem of the antiquity of man, and probably never will. Besides, the Bible makes no pretence of giving us a scientific chronology. Father Pope well says : "It is well to bear in mind that the Biblical chronological system is in no sense a scientific one, that its details are often conflicting, that starting as it does from the beginning when there can have been no means of dating events—it is possibly only meant as a guide to the memory, and not as a clue to history. On the other hand none of the dates assigned by scholars to the events of this early period can be regarded as more than approximate, and should not be regarded as solid means of testing the Biblical statements" (*The Catholic Student's Aids to the Bible*, i., 21).

Take for example the period from the Creation to the Flood: the Hebrew Bible reckons 1,656 years, the Septuagint 2,242, and the Samaritan 1,307. These variants do not arise, as some used to think, from the mistakes of copyists or translators, but plainly indicate different systems of chronology. The Church has never interfered with the freedom of scientists in determining the age of the race from the data of prehistory, geology or anthropology. In the name of common sense, however, she asks scientists not to give forth their guesses as absolute truths. If

the Abbé Breuil, one of the most eminent modern anthropologists, asserts that man has lived upon this earth about 20,000 years, and Sir Arthur Keith, another eminent anthropologist, pleads for 350,000; if some scientists reckon the duration of the post-glacial epoch at five thousand years (Wright) and others at 20,000 (Penck), you cannot blame the outsider from being utterly sceptical about these varying figures.

42. Is not the story of the deluge a legend ?

No, the deluge is an historical fact attested by every Catholic writer from the very beginning of Christianity. Christ speaks of it as being no less real than His second coming (Matt. xxiv. 37-39). The Epistle to the Hebrews refers to Noe's "framing of the ark for the saving of his house" (xi. 7). St. Peter twice refers to the flood as an historical fact (1 Peter iii. 20; 2 Peter ii. 5; Cf. Isa. liv. 9; Eccclus. xliv. 18). The tradition of the deluge is the most universal tradition in the history of primitive man. Andrée enumerates eighty-eight flood stories among the ancients, and considers sixty-two of them independent of the Hebrew and Chaldaic tradition (*Die Flutsagen Ethnographisch Betrachtet*).

Catholics to-day do not believe in the geographical universality of the deluge, although they believe that it destroyed the whole human race, except Noe and his family (Gen. vii. 1; 1 Peter iii. 20).

43. Is not the Bible the only source of faith ?

No, the Bible is not the only source of faith, as Luther taught in the sixteenth century, for without the intervention of a divine infallible teaching apostolate distinct from the Bible, we could never know with divine certainty what books constitute the inspired Scriptures, or whether the copies we possess to-day agree with the originals.

The Bible itself is but a dead letter calling for a divine interpreter; it is not arranged in systematic form like a creed or catechism; it is often obscure and hard to be understood, as St. Peter says of the Epistles of St. Paul (2 Peter iii. 16; Cf. Acts viii. 30, 31); it is open to many a false interpretation. Moreover, a number of revealed truths have been handed down by divine tradition only.

When Luther first put forth this false view of the transmission of divine revelation, he stated that the Bible could be interpreted by everyone, "even by the humble miller's maid, nay by a child of nine," but when the Anabaptists, the Zwinglians

and others denied his teaching, the Bible became "a heresy book," most obscure and difficult to understand.

"What did Luther set up," asks a Protestant theologian, "as a principle of interpretation?" He answers: "In *theory* that Scripture interprets itself; in *practice*, however, as it does not, his own theology" (Kohler, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1902, 576).

44. Did not Christ say: "Search (you search—indicative not imperative) the Scriptures, for ye think in them ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39) ?

Christ is not telling the Jews to read the New Testament, which did not exist, to find out His Gospel, but He is insisting upon the fact that they did read the Old Testament with no profit, because they failed to recognize Him as their Messias. The prophets of the Law taught that He was the Messias, the Son of God, in whom they were to believe in order to have eternal life (John iii. 16).

45. By what right do you teach doctrines not in the Bible ? Does not this put the Church above the Word of God ?

Because the Bible nowhere implies that it is the only source of faith. On the contrary St. Paul expressly teaches that Christians must believe not only what he *wrote* but what he *preached*. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 14). "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast *heard* of me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus. Keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost" (2 Tim. i. 13, 14). "The things which thou hast *heard* of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2).

The Council of Trent "seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand, following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety all the books of the Old and New Testaments.....and also the said traditions.....preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession" (Sess. iv.).

The Bible in many passages tells us that the divine teaching

of Christ is transmitted to us by teachers accredited by God. St. Matthew speaks of this Apostolate as a divinely authorized teaching of the whole doctrine of Christ to all men of all times, who are to accept it once they are baptized. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19).

St. Mark speaks of the divine sanction given this "preaching": "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16).

St. Luke speaks of the Apostolate of "preaching in Christ's name to all nations" (xxiv. 27), and declares the Apostles authentic witnesses of a divine revelation, which is infallibly guaranteed by the Holy Ghost : "You shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you and you shall be witnesses (Cf. Luke xxiv. 48) unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8).

St. John speaks of Christ's appointment of St. Peter as the permanent visible head of the teaching Apostolate, chosen to take the place of Christ with power to feed His flock with divine truth (John xxi. 15, 17). At the Last Supper Christ emphasizes the infallibility of the Apostles' perpetual preaching under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. "I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive : He shall abide with you and be in you" (John xiv. 16, 17 ; Cf. John xiv. 25, 26 ; xv. 26, 27 ; xiv. 13).

This Apostolate was not for the Apostles alone, but for their successors, who were always to be received as Christ Himself. "He that heareth you heareth Me ; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me ; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me" (Luke x. 16).

The teaching of Christ that His Gospel is to be learned not from the Bible alone, but from a divine, infallible Apostolate until the end of the world, is clearly set forth by St. Paul. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed ? Or how shall they believe Him of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a preacher ? And how shall they preach unless they be sent ?...Faith then

cometh by hearing.... But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world" (Rom. x. 14-18; *Cf.* Eph. iv. 11-15).

The Apostles always represented themselves as the ambassadors of God (Rom. i. 5; xv. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 16; iii. 9; 1 John iv. 6); they proved their divine mission by miracles (1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 5); they required all the faithful to obey their divine message (Rom. i. 5; 2 Cor. x. 4-6); they anathematized those who refused to accept it. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 8; *Cf.* Mark xv. 16).

That men were to learn the Gospel not from their private interpretation of the Bible, but from this permanent Apostolate is clear from the fact that the Apostles appointed successors to themselves, and ordered them in turn to appoint others to carry on their work. "Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me.... Keep the good thing committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us" (2 Tim. i. 13, 14). "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2).

The continual belief of the Church in this matter was summed up by the Bishop of Lyons, St. Irenaeus (140-205). He clearly taught that all Christians were to learn the Gospel from the tradition of the Apostles and their successors, especially from the tradition of the Apostolic See of Rome. He writes: "Therefore in every Church there is the tradition of the Apostles made manifest throughout the whole world; and we can enumerate those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and the successors of those Bishops down to ourselves." Then after mentioning Smyrna, which through St. Polycarp (d. 155) takes us back to St. John, he adds: "But it would be too long to enumerate here the successions of all the Churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by Episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. This tradition suffices of itself to confound all those who, in one way or another, by self-conceit, vain glory, blindness or erroneous judgment, have deviated from the truth. Indeed, the superior pre-eminence of that Church is such that every Church—I mean the faithful of any country

whatever—necessarily agrees with her, that is, every Church in any country in which the Apostolic tradition has been preserved without interruption" (*Adv. Hær.* iii., 3).

46. Catholics argue in a vicious circle, proving the Church from the Bible and the Bible from the Church.

Research and reason assure us the Bible is a credible historical record. This credible record tells us that Jesus Christ claimed and proved Himself to be God, and that He established a Church which He guaranteed would be infallible in matters of faith and morals. This Church proposes to us certain things to be believed and done. Among the former is that the Bible is the inspired revelation of God. Hence, the Church uses it to propose to our faith certain doctrines contained therein. This is no vicious circle, for from the Bible considered as a reliable historic document we argue to the divinely constituted and guaranteed Church, and then from the teachings of such a Church show the inspiration of the Bible. Reason tells us the Bible is credible. Reason tells us the Bible shows the Church to be credible. The Church tells us the Bible is not only credible, but inspired, that is, credible not only because research and reason say so, but also because God says so. The nature of inspiration is explained in question 35.

47. Was not Luther the first to translate the Bible into the vernacular ?

No, Luther was not the first to translate the Bible into the vernacular. His translation of the New Testament was not published until 1522, and his version of the Old Testament not until 1534. Catholics from 1466 to 1522 had already published fourteen complete editions of the Bible in High German at Augsburg, Basle, Strassburg and Nuremburg, and five in Low German at Cologne, Delf, Halberstadt and Lubeck (*Janssen, History of the German People*, xiv., 388). During this same period—from 1450 to 1520—Catholics had published 156 Latin and 6 Hebrew editions of the Bible, besides issuing complete translations in Italian (11), French (10), Bohemian (2), Flemish (1), Limousine (1), and Russian (1).

48. Was not the Bible practically unknown in the Middle Ages, when your Church was dominant ?

No, Luther's statement that before his time "the Bible lay under the bench forgotten in the dust" is simply not true. Indeed the Bible was "the most widely circulated book in the

Middle Ages, and had a great influence on the life of the nations" (Michael, *Geschichte der Deutschen Volkes*, iii., 223). The priests used it in preparing their sermons, and knew it from their daily reading of the missal and the breviary. The monks copied the Scriptures in their *scriptoria*, and meditated upon them frequently as we learn from the pages of St. Bernard and Thomas à Kempis (*The Imitation of Christ*, iv., 11; Luddy, *Life of St. Bernard*). The laity, before printing was invented and when Bible manuscripts were rare and costly, knew the Scriptures from listening to sermons, and from studying the sculpture, paintings, frescoes and mosaics that filled their churches. What a comprehensive view of both the Old Testament and the New could be had by a parishioner of St. Mark's in Venice in the thirteenth century. As Ruskin says: "The walls of the Church became the poor man's Bible, and a picture was more easily read than a chapter" (*The Stones of Venice*, ii., 99).

Many non-Catholics have answered the above question in the negative. "We must admit," writes Dobschütz, "that the Middle Ages possessed a quite surprising and extremely praiseworthy knowledge of the Bible, such as might in many respects put our own age to shame" (*Deutsche Rundschau*, 1900, 61). "There is," writes Dr. Cutts, "a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle ages. Some people think it was very little read, even by the clergy; whereas the fact is that the sermons of the medieval preachers are more full of Scriptural quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of Scriptural allusion, that it is evident their minds were saturated with Scriptural diction" (*Turning Points of English History*, 200).

49. Are Catholics to-day forbidden to read the Bible ?

They are not forbidden but encouraged to read the Bible. The Catholic Church, as the guardian and interpreter of the Scriptures, must needs prevent her people from being led astray by false translations of the Bible, which are often accompanied by glosses and notes destructive of the Catholic faith. But she never has prohibited versions in the vernacular which have been approved by the Bishops of the various countries, and have been edited with explanatory notes by Catholic scholars.

On the title page of our English Bibles we may read the letter (April, 1778) of Pius VI to the Archbishop of Florence, wherein he urges Catholics to read the Bible. He writes: "At a time when a great many books which grossly attack the Catholic religion are being circulated even among the unlearned, to the

great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be urged to read the Holy Scriptures; for they are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to everyone, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, and to eradicate the errors which are so widely spread in these corrupt times."

50. Why did the monks of the Middle Ages chain the Bible in their libraries and churches ?

The Bible and other books were chained in the libraries and churches of the Middle Ages to preserve them from theft and especially to make them accessible to students.

The Reformers adopted this custom of having chained Bibles in their churches, and the practice lasted for over three hundred years. There were chained libraries at Grantham (1598), Bolton (1651) and Wimborne (1686), and chained Bibles in many of the English churches (Chelsea, East Winch, Evesham, Minehead, Milton, Shorwell, Stratford). The Oxford Colleges of Brasenose and Merton did not remove the chains until the eighteenth century, while some libraries removed them only in the nineteenth (Manchester, Cirencester, Llanbadarn).

At the present time we have records of over five thousand chained books in eleven Protestant and two Catholic libraries.

V. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

51. Did Christ really establish a society which all were bound to join ?

Catholics believe with the Vatican Council "that in order to perpetuate the saving work of Redemption, the Eternal Bishop of souls decreed to establish a Holy Church, to which all the faithful might be gathered together by the unity of faith and love, as in the house of God."

The Bible plainly teaches that Christ established a divine society, when He gave the Apostles the power to teach (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15), to govern (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 21), and to sanctify the souls of men (Matt. xxviii. 20; John xx. 22; Luke xxii. 19). Christ's true followers are to accept their teaching (Mark xvi. 16), obey their commandments (Luke x. 16; Matt. xviii. 17), and to use the divine means of sanctification (John iii. 5; vi. 54) which Christ instituted.

The Church is a divine society, divine in its origin, and supernatural in its end and means. It is, therefore, unfailing and perpetual, always opposed by the world as was Christ, her divine Founder, and always conquering her enemies, as Christ once won the victory of the Resurrection through the seeming failure of the Cross.

The Church is at the same time a human society, because it consists of human members. That is why scandals, heresies and schisms arise. Christ Himself foretold this, when He compared the Kingdom of God to a field in which cockle grew together with the wheat; or to a net containing good fish and bad (Matt. xiii. 24, 47).

52. Is it not a fact that the Catholic Church became corrupt and so changed by the sixteenth century, that it no longer represented the Church that Christ established?

No, this is not a fact, although the sixteenth century Reformers made this false assertion, so as to give their followers a pretext for establishing their various separatist sects.

While human societies and states have a natural tendency to become corrupt and perish in the course of time, a supernatural, divine society like the Catholic Church cannot fail or become corrupt, for its Divine Founder, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are to abide with it until the end of the world (Matt. xvii. 10; John xiv. 16). The prophets of the Old Law always declared that the Kingdom of Christ would be a lasting Kingdom (Dan. ii. 44; Isa. ix. 6, 7), a teaching confirmed by Christ in the parables of the cockle (Matt. xiii. 24-41) and the net (Matt. xiii. 47-50). Moreover our Lord explicitly promised that "the gates of hell (*i.e.*, the power of death or the power of the devil) shall not prevail against it" (the Church).

53. Will you not admit that a Reformation was needed in the sixteenth century?

Catholics readily grant that a reformation in the lives of many unworthy Catholic clerics and laymen was indeed called for in the sixteenth century, and historians like Pastor have admitted the worldliness, immorality, nepotism, and avarice that marked many of the clergy (*History of the Popes*, vii., 291-328). Pastor, however, warns us against the unfair exaggerations of bigoted controversialists, and gives us a list of eighty-eight saints and *beati* who died in Italy alone between the years 1400 and 1529 (*Ibid.*, v., 86-88).

Catholics, however, hold that a Reformation in the sense of

a secession from the Church established by Christ, fostered by kings and princes desirous of the Church's lands and revenues, and denying the divine doctrines, government and worship of the Gospel, could not be of God. The good Catholic remained within the fold, and prayed and worked for reform, like a St. Canisius or a St. Charles Borromeo; the immoral Catholic, like Henry VIII of England, or the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, apostatized.

It is true indeed that Leo X (1517-1521) and Clement VII (1523-1534) did not measure up to their task, as Pastor admits (*Ibid.*, vii., 9), but we must not forget that the Council of Trent, which was to bring about the Counter-Reformation, was retarded not by the Popes, but by the princes of the time.

The chief cause of the Reformation was the gradual weakening of the bond of Catholic unity and faith during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The antipathy to the Holy See on the continent began with Philip the Fair's quarrel with Boniface VIII (1285-1378), and was intensified by the residence of the Popes at Avignon (1309-1376), the rebellion of Louis of Bavaria (1314-1346), and the Great Western Schism (1378-1417). The Black Death (1348-1350), which killed more than one third of Western Europe in two years, had lowered greatly the standard of culture among the clergy, and hastened the development of a narrow nationalism, which resented the clergy's financial power, and lusted for the wealth the Church had accumulated down the centuries. The weakening of moral discipline among the clergy and people was the chief factor in bringing about the Protestant revolt. A faithful, devout body of Christians, in the first three centuries, died gladly for the faith; the worldly, avaricious, and immoral Christians of the sixteenth century easily lost the faith that they had ceased to practice.

54. Why do you arrogantly claim that your Church is infallible?

Because she alone represents Christ, the Divine, Infallible Teacher, in conduct, belief and worship. She alone says to the world, as Christ did: "I am the Way (conduct), the Truth (belief) and the Life (worship)" (John xiv. 5).

Reason and revelation alike demand that the teacher of the divine revelation of Christ speak as He did, infallibly, *i. e.*, that she by divine guidance be ever kept free from the liability of error. A non-Catholic writer, Mallock, in his *Is Life Worth Living?*, 267, states the Catholic doctrine well. He says: "Any supernatural religion that renounces its claim to this

(infallibility), it is clear, can profess to be a semi-revelation only. It is a hybrid thing, partly natural and partly supernatural, and it thus practically has all the qualities of a religion that is wholly natural. In so far as it professes to be revealed, it of course professes to be infallible; but if the revealed part be in the first place hard to distinguish, and in the second place hard to understand; if it may mean many things, and many of these things contradictory, it might as well never have been made at all. To make it in any sense an infallible revelation, or in other words a revelation at all to us, we need a power to interpret the testament that shall have equal authority with that testament itself."

Would a good God, who "wills all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4), fail to provide His revelation with a living infallible witness? Would a just God command us to believe under penalty of hell (Mark xvi. 16), and at the same time leave us to the mercy of every false prophet (Matt. xiii. 21) and lying teacher (2 Peter ii. 1), preaching a Gospel opposed to His (Gal. i. 8)?

No, the Church Christ founded is everywhere spoken of in the New Testament as a divine, infallible teaching authority. Christ says that His Church is like a city firmly built upon a rock foundation, which can never be destroyed by Satan and the powers of evil (Matt. xvi. 18; Cf. Matt. vii. 24; Ps. cxvi. 5).

Throughout the Gospels the mission of the Apostles and their successors is declared identical with the mission of Christ and His heavenly Father. "As the Father sends Me (to give infallible witness to the truth, John xviii. 37; Cf. Matt. i. 38), I send you" (John xx. 21), "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me" (John xiii. 20), "He that receiveth you, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me" (Matt. x. 40; Cf. Luke x. 16; John xiii. 44-48; John xv. 20, 24). "We are of God," says St. John. "He that knoweth God, heareth us. He that is not of God heareth us not. By this you know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error" (1 John iv. 6).

When Christ gave the Apostles their divine commission for all nations until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), He promised: "I am with you always." This phrase is used at least ninety times in the Bible and outside of the few instances in which it implies a mere salutation (Ruth ii. 4; Rom. xvi. 33), it signifies that God will ensure the success of the person's undertaking (Gen. xxxix. 2; Exod. iii. 12; Jer. i. 19; Num. xiv. 42). If the Apostles are to be successful in their divine mission of teaching for all time, they and their successors must needs be infallible.

In His last discourse to the Apostles our Saviour promised to send them the Holy Ghost, who would abide with them forever, and teach them all things that He had taught them (John xiv. 26): He is the Spirit of Truth, whom the world of unbelievers (John xv. 19; xvii. 9, 25) cannot receive (John xiv. 13-17, 25, 26, xv. 26; xvi. 13). The Church that witnesses (Luke xxiv. 28; Acts i. 9) to Christ must be infallible.

The Apostles always declare that their teaching is the Word of God (Acts iv. 31; viii. 14; xii. 24; xiii. 44; xv. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; 2 Tim. ii. 9), which they voice infallibly by the assistance of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii. 4; iv. 31; xv. 25-28; 1 Cor. ii. 4-16), who confirms their witness by miracles (Acts iii. 16; iv. 29-31; v. 12, 16; ix. 32-42). All other teaching is false and blasphemous, even if it were to come from an angel of God (Acts xiii. 18; Gal. i. 8, 9).

The Catholic Church with St. Paul says to her children: "When you had received of us the word of the hearing of God you received it not as the word of men, but as it is indeed, the word of God" (1 Thess. i. 5, 6). She is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 13), a metaphor of the Apostle, that evidently signifies unshaken firmness in witnessing to the truth of Christ (Jer. 1. 18; Col. i. 23; Apoc. iii. 12).

If you study the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, the various Creeds, and the Councils of the Church from Jerusalem to the Council of the Vatican, you must needs admit that the Church always considered herself infallible, condemning as a heretic outside her fold anyone who denied even one dogma of the Faith. As St. Irenæus said in the second century: "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace. For the Spirit is the truth" (*Adv. Hæc.*, iii., 24).

55. Is not your doctrine of infallibility opposed to freedom of thought ?

The doctrine of infallibility is indeed opposed to the false freedom of believing error, but not to the true freedom of believing the truth. We have no right to believe what is false, any more than we have a right to do what is evil. Our Saviour plainly taught us that error and sin imply not the freedom, but the slavery of the intellect and the will. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii. 32; v. 34).

A Catholic does not give a blind, degrading obedience to a fallible, human authority, that may ask him to believe without

question the most preposterous statements, but a divine authority, that can neither deceive him nor be deceived. "The testimony of God is greater than the testimony of men," says St. John (1 John v. 9). He is not hampered in his search for truth, but like the true scientist, builds upon facts and principles he already knows.

Infallibility is the corrective of error in matters of belief, conduct and worship. "It is," as Cardinal Newman says, "a supply for a need, and it does not go beyond the need. Its object is, and its effect also, not to enfeeble the freedom or vigor of human thought, but to resist and control its extravagances" (*Apologia*, 253). It is like the compass on the modern ocean liner or aeroplane, that points out the true course in the darkness and in the fog.

56. Do not converts to your infallible Church have to surrender their reason?

No, the Catholic faith is most reasonable, for the ultimate authority on which we believe is the voice of God speaking to us through the Church. As Dr. Brownson says: "It is not the Church that establishes spiritual despotism; it is she who saves us from it. Spiritual despotism is that which subjects us in spiritual matters to a human authority, whether our own or that of others; and the only redemption from it is having in them a divine authority. The Church teaches by divine authority; in submitting to her we submit to God, and are freed from all human authority. She teaches infallibly; therefore, in believing what she teaches, we believe the truth, which frees us from falsehood and error, to which all men without an infallible guide are subject, and submission to which is the elemental principle of all spiritual despotism" (*Works*, x., 128).

The strange notion that converts are always in perpetual warfare with their own reason is thus dismissed by Cardinal Newman: "It is no difficult thing for a Catholic to believe; it is not without an effort, a miserable effort, that anyone who has received that gift, unlearns to believe. He does violence to his mind, not in exercising, but in withholding his faith. When objections occur to him, which they may easily do if he lives in the world, they are as odious and as unwelcome to him as impure thoughts are to the virtuous. He does certainly shrink from them, he flings them away from him, but why? Not in the first instance, because they are dangerous, but because they are cruel and base. His loving Lord has done everything for him, and has He deserved such a return?" (*Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, 223).

57. Did not Luther, in his bold protest against the Catholic Church, uphold the rights of reason ?

On the contrary no one ever rated reason so low as Luther, who believed that original sin meant the utter corruption of human nature. He told his followers at Wittenberg that they must hate reason as their greatest foe. He frequently called reason "the devil's whore"; "the arch-enemy of the faith"; "a crazy witch," on whom the heathen hung when they thought themselves cleverest. The incomprehensibility of the mysteries of faith, for the understanding of which reason alone does not suffice, Luther represents as an open contradiction to reason. To him reason and philosophy are necessarily opposed to God. Harnack says on this point: "Luther conceived a distrust of reason itself, not to be explained simply by his distrust of it, as the main prop of self-righteousness. . . . No one can despise reason with impunity, and Luther himself was punished by the darkening of his own views on faith" (*Grisar, Luther*, i., 158; iii., 21; v. 4; vi., 365).

58. Does not the Catholic Church hinder the direct relationship of the soul to God ?

No, on the contrary, her sole aim is to bring souls into intimate union with God, by having them participate in the redeeming work of Jesus Christ on the Cross,—chiefly by the Mass and the Sacraments.

The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, has the Mass, which renews every day upon our altars the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. It is "a propitiatory Sacrifice," as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xii., can. 3), "whereby God grants grace and the gift of repentance, and remits crimes and even the greatest sin" (*Ibid.*, ch. 2).

By Baptism a Catholic is united to Christ as the Branch is united to the vine (John xv. 1-7); faith, hope and charity are infused into our souls (Trent, Sess. vi., ch. 7), so that we become "partakers of the Divine Nature" (2 Peter i. 4), and are given "the adoption of sons" (Gal. iv. 4-7; Rom. viii. 14-17). If, committing grievous sin, we lose the grace of God, the Church gives us a chance to regain it by means of the Sacrament of Penance. Through Holy Communion the Catholic is most intimately united with Christ, according to His promise: "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him" (John vi. 57).

The veneration that Catholics pay to the Blessed Virgin and

the saints brings us closer to Christ, if we but imitate their virtues. With the Mother of God they say to us: "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye"; and with St. Paul: "Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ" (John ii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 2).

59. If, as you pretend, the claims of your Church are so strong, why is it that so many intelligent non-Catholics fail to see their force?

The reason is that they have never considered the claims of the Church in their entirety, or, if they have studied them fairly well, they have approached the study with minds full of prejudice and hearts full of sin.

More people are kept out of the Catholic Church by prejudice than by intellectual difficulties. A Methodist or Baptist of Mississippi or Alabama, who has been taught from childhood by parents whom he loves, and by teachers and friends whom he respects, that the Catholic Church is an unreasonable, unscientific, unscriptural, superstitious, intolerant, and foreign system of priestly imposture, must fight valiantly the prejudices of a lifetime, before he can weigh carefully the divine claims of Catholicism. The same can be said of many Hindus, Moham-medans and Buddhists.

Our Lord and His Apostles tell us that worldliness and sensuality frequently blind men's minds to the light of truth. "The world has not known Thee, just Father," says, Christ. "The sensual man," says St. Paul, "perceiveth not those things that are of the Spirit of God; for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand" (John xvii. 25; Cf. xv. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 14).

60. What do Catholics mean by unity?

Catholics, taught by Christ, and the divine tradition handed down from the beginning of Christianity, believe that the Catholic Church alone possesses a unity of divine government, divine faith and divine worship.

Jesus Christ never spoke of a plurality of Churches, but of "My Church," when He first promised Peter, chief Apostle, that He would make him the rock foundation of the divine Society He was about to establish. When He referred to the Kingdom of God prophesied in the Old Testament, He called it the kingdom of heaven, the city on the hill, the net containing good and bad fishes, the field of the wheat and the tares, the pearl of great price, the one fold of the One Shepherd. The Church is always pictured in the New Testament as visibly one,

presided over by the shepherd Peter, who represents Christ, the Good Shepherd, a kingdom of God, telling all men until the last day to *believe* only what He and His Apostles taught, to *obey* His and their commands to *worship* as He ordered (Matt. xvi. iii. 24; v. 14; xiii. 47, 24, 25; John x. 16; xxi. 17).

Christ plainly foretold that the gates of hell would never prevail against His Church, and that He would provide for its unity by His abiding presence, and the power of the Holy Spirit. For "every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation, and house against house shall fall" (Luke xi. 17). We readily grant that the private judgment of the individual, and the selfish nationalism of the nations would *naturally* bring about disunion in the Church, but the Divine Builder ensured its unity by a special *supernatural* grace, which He asked of His Heavenly Father the night before He died. There can be no doubt of the meaning of our Lord's prayer: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us...and the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as We also are One" (John xvii. 21, 22). The unity Christ prays for is to be the most striking mark of His true Church, for it is founded on the mutual love of Father and Son in the unity of the Most Blessed Trinity.

St. Paul insists upon the unity of the Church in his every Epistle. Although he mentions individual local Churches in certain cities (Col. iv. 15, 16), he teaches clearly that they are parts of the one Church in every place (1 Thess. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 14). The Church is not a mere organization that may divide and subdivide like a nation or a club, but a divine organism with its own inherent principle of life. It is Christ's Mystical Body, of which He is the Head and all Christians the members. It is founded by *One* Lord, animated by *One* Spirit, entered into by *One* Baptism, ruled by a *united* episcopate, and having *one* aim, the glory of God and the salvation of men's souls (Acts i. 28; Rom. xii. 4-8; 1 Cor. xii. 12-27; Eph. iv. 3-16).

"For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free. ... You are the body of Christ, and members of member" (1 Cor. xii. 12-27). "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one Baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all,

and in us all. . . . And He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet in the unity of faith . . . that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv. 3-14).

The "comprehensiveness" of which some modern Christians boast is clearly negatived by the Apostle. We are not free to deny in any one point the "sacred deposit of sound doctrine" (1 Tim. i. 10, 11; vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14), but are "to avoid the profane novelties of words, and oppositions of knowledge falsely so-called," and "to shun those who have erred from the truth, and have subverted the faith" (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 16-18). We must ever "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude i. 3) and pronounce anathema even upon an angel, who would dare teach an alien gospel (Gal. i. 8-12).

The Catholic Church is distinguished from all other churches by the mark of unity. The churches that are in communion with the See of Rome are all agreed in matters of faith. Ask any Catholic bishop or priest the world over to explain any Catholic doctrine, and he will give you substantially the same answer. "Mere tradition will not account for it; for human traditions vary, and tend to become contradictory, especially as they spread. Mere authority will not account for it, or written declarations or decrees. For why should so many millions freely and gladly submit to this authority, and as freely and gladly reverence and obey these decrees? There must be some guiding Spirit, which animates the whole, and inspires alike teachers and taught. A complex organism can remain one only so long as there is a vital force within it" (Walker, *The Problem of Reunion*, 232). The same holds good for worship. In every Catholic church in the world the same Mass is offered daily, and the same seven Sacraments administered to the people. The unity of faith and worship are safeguarded by the Pope, who rules the whole flock in Christ's name and with His authority.

61. Is not the universal Church one, inasmuch as it is made up of the Roman, Anglican and Eastern Churches, which are entirely independent, yet bound together as branches of the one Church?

By no means. This Branch Theory held by certain members

of the High Church party of the Church of England is a visionary, illogical, incoherent theory, repudiated alike by both Rome and Constantinople, and possessing not the slightest warrant either in the Sacred Scriptures or in the writings of the Fathers.

Our Saviour indeed uses the symbol of Christians as branches in a vine, but they are branches joined to each other visibly and really by their common life in the trunk, which is Christ the Lord. It is a symbol of UNITED branches. The schismatic, or separated branch, as Christ says, "shall be cast forth as a branch and shall wither, and they shall gather him up, and cast him into the fire, and he burneth" (John xv. 6).

According to the Fathers of the Church, who frequently discuss the point, a schism is not merely "an unfortunate misunderstanding" among Christians, but "an invention of the devil," as St. Cyprian calls it (*The Unity of the Church*), implying a real breach of intercommunion and "a stealing of men from the Church." That a man could separate from the Church and at the same time be a Catholic, was to them inconceivable (Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, ch. vii.).

Moreover this theory supposes, contrary to facts, that there is one great Eastern Church, united in the same primitive faith, that ever agreed in denying the Papal claims. This is a mere figment of the imagination. No such body ever existed. The East has been from the beginning, and it is to-day, full of heresies and schisms. Besides the sixteen branches of the Eastern Orthodox Church (Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, 273), there are other Eastern Churches, the Nestorian, the Coptic, the Jacobite, and the Armenian, who are no more in communion with her than with us Catholics. The Orthodox regard them as heretics and schismatics. Do our Anglican friends regard them as real branches? How can they do so in the face of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon?

62. What are the differences between the Orthodox Eastern Church and the Catholic Church?

The Orthodox Eastern Church, numbering about 94,000,000, consists of sixteen independent Churches, over which the Patriarch of Constantinople has a jurisdiction of honour. Before the schism there were but five patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus. Since the schism each politically independent State has its own Church, viz., Russia, Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania and Bulgaria. Mount Sinai is an independent Church, and there are four in what was once the Austrian Empire. The revolution

has played sad havoc with the Church in Russia, which has been split up into many divisions under the Soviets' rule.

The Orthodox express their faith by the Creeds, the decisions of the first seven Councils, and certain confessions of faith. They believe their communion to be the only true Church of Christ, reject the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, and teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father alone. They believe in an objective Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, but believe that the change takes place not at the words of consecration as we do, but at the invocation of the Holy Ghost (*Epiklesis*), which follow them in the Mass. They deny Purgatory in the sense of a cleansing fire, while praying for the dead. They deny the Immaculate Conception, especially since its definition by the Pope.

The Orthodox always baptize by immersion, administer Confirmation immediately after Baptism, give Communion under both kinds four times a year, Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday and the Feast of the Assumption, hear confessions on rare occasions, anoint both the sick and the well, allow divorce in case of adultery, ordain by laying on one hand only, etc.

The Eastern Orthodox Church is nearer to Catholicism than any other religious body. They believe in a visible Church with authority to declare the true faith; they accept all the books of the Old Testament and the New; they believe in the Mass and the priesthood; they believe in seven Sacraments; they honour and pray to the saints and to the Blessed Virgin.

Besides the Orthodox Church there are the Lesser Eastern Churches, *i.e.*, the Coptic, Jacobite, Nestorian and Armenian, which all sprang from the two great heresies of the fifth century, Nestorianism, condemned at Ephesus in 431, and Monophysitism, condemned at Chalcedon in 451 (*Cf. Fortescue, The Lesser Eastern Churches*).

At various times in Church history members of these three main classes of Eastern Churches, the Orthodox, the Nestorians and the Monophysites, have repented of their schism, and joined again the true Church. These are known as Uniates. They number about six million souls, and are divided as follows: Greeks, Italo-Greeks, Georgians, Melchites, Ruthenians, Serbians, Bulgarians and Roumanians. In South India during the last decade many thousands of the Jacobites have followed two of their Bishops—Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilos—into the Catholic Church. The movement still continues vigorously.

63. You claim to have always taught the same doc-

trines. Why I remember myself two new teachings of your Church in recent times, viz., the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope, declared only in 1854 and 1870.

The Catholic Church teaches clearly that after the death of St. John there has been no objective increase in the deposit of faith, but that there has been progress and development in our understanding of it.

Christ plainly taught that the Apostles were to preach "all that He commanded" (Matt. xxiii. 20), and St. Paul insists repeatedly upon the unchanging character of the Gospel, and the utter impossibility of any new teaching being of Christ (Gal. i. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 29; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14; ii. 2; Heb. viii. 7; xii. 27, 28; vii. 11).

The Vatican Council says: "For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by His revelation they might make known NEW doctrine, but that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles" (Sess. iv., ch. iv.).

The Catholic Church is Christ's Mystical Body, as the Sacred Scriptures teach (2 Cor. xii. 27; Col. i. 13; Rom. vi. 5), animated by a life-giving soul, which is Christ's Holy Spirit (St. Augustine, Ser. 267). Life everywhere manifests growth and development. The living Church, therefore, must always manifest a constantly expanding growth and a corresponding internal development. The Gospel was not given to us in the Bible alone as a series of clearly defined theses in a theological textbook, but was set forth in various narratives and discourses as occasion demanded. Not everything was written in the Bible, as St. Paul plainly teaches (2 Thess. ii. 14).

From the very beginning men endeavoured to read their own heretical opinions into the pages of the Sacred Scriptures, and in this way they gave the world many false teachings regarding the Trinity, the Incarnation, Original Sin, and the like.

The Church, as the divine teacher of revelation, declared clearly the true doctrine and condemned every false opinion that contradicted it. This could only be done by defining the true doctrine in clearer and more definite terms, as each varying heresy arose within her fold. In this consists the development of doctrine.

Did men claim, for example, that the Son of God was a mere creature? (Arius.) She proclaims the Divinity of the Word

made Flesh (Nicæa, 325). Did men claim that Christ was two distinct Persons, the Divine and the Human? (Nestorius.) She declares that He was one Divine Person (Ephesus, 431). Did men claim that the Human Nature had been absorbed into the Divine? (Eutyches.) She asserts that Christ possessed both a Human and a Divine Nature, "not confused, changed, divided or separated" (Chalcedon, 431). In the sixteenth century, when the Reformers in England and on the continent maintained false views about the Bible, Divine Tradition, the Mass and the Sacraments, the Church, as the divine guardian of the revelation of God, condemned their errors, and set forth accurately the true doctrine.

The doctrine of development is taught by our Lord in the parable of the mustard seed (Matt. xiii. 31), and in His teaching about the guidance of the Holy Spirit (John xiv. 26 ; xvi. 13). St. Paul elaborates it in his letter to the Ephesians (iv. 11-16). He represents the Church as a living body, growing and developing, meeting every attack of heresy, yet continually progressing "in the knowledge of the Son of God."

The classic treatise on the subject is Cardinal Newman's *An Essay on Development*, which is not a new teaching as some have asserted, but a scholarly outline of the teaching of the Bible and Divine Tradition.

64. Has not your Church, by striving to maintain an absolute uniformity of belief, always been the determined enemy of science ?

No, the Catholic Church has never been the enemy of science, although this calumny has often been made by bitter anti-Christians, obsessed by what Father Wasmann calls "an absolute *theophobia*, a dread of the Creator" (*The Problem of Evolution*, 47), and consequently of God's Church. Dr. Walsh, in *The Popes and Science*, has ably refuted the two writers who have done their utmost to popularize this calumny in this country, viz., White, *The Warfare of Science with Theology*, and Draper, *The Conflict Between Religion and Science*.

The Church has no quarrel with the proved facts of science, which she accepts on the authority of various specialists. She is not in the world to teach men the distance between the earth and the sun, the action of nitric or sulphuric acid, or the composition of the rocks on the earth's surface. In the name of science, however, she warns us not to accept the erroneous guesses of some scientists as positive facts. Huxley once declared a certain chemical compound to be an organized living thing, but when

called to account he at once acknowledged his mistake. Lesser men, as St. Augustine warns us, ought "not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known." If dissension arise, St. Augustine thus advises the theologian: "Whatever scientists demonstrate to be true, we must prove can be reconciled with our Scriptures; and whatever they assert contrary to those Scriptures, i.e., the Catholic faith, we must either prove to be false, or we must, without the slightest hesitation, believe to be true. . . . The Holy Ghost did not intend to teach men the essential nature of the things of the visible universe, things in no way profitable for salvation" (*Providentissimus Deus*).

The Vatican Council teaches plainly that the Church is not the enemy of science, and that faith cannot contradict reason. "Faith and reason are of mutual help to each other; by reason well applied, the foundations of faith are established, and in the light of faith, the science of divinity is built up. Faith, on the other hand, frees and preserves reason from error, and enriches it with knowledge. The Church, therefore, far from hindering the pursuit of the arts and sciences, fosters and promotes them in many ways. . . . Nor does she prevent sciences, each in its own sphere, from making use of their own principles and methods. Yet, while acknowledging the freedom due to them, she tries to preserve them from falling into error contrary to divine doctrine; and from overstepping their own boundaries, and throwing into confusion matters that belong to the domain of faith" (Sess. ii., ch. 4).

The German Jesuit, Father Kneller, has compiled a list of believing scientists in the nineteenth century (*Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science*). He says rightly: "Even if it were true that modern scientists as one man stood out against Christ and the Church, this would offer no disproof of Christianity. . . . Materialism, atheism, and positivism are not observed facts, but systems of philosophy, inferences from facts, and inferences which fall, properly speaking, within the province not of science, but of metaphysics. With regard to conclusions of this order, the scientist is not, as such, the authoritative judge."

65. Did not Pope Boniface VIII forbid dissection?

No, Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) in his Bull on Burials, issued in 1302, did not prohibit dissection for medical purposes, but legislated against a barbarous custom of the crusading nobles, who, dying in foreign lands, were anxious to be buried in their native land. "The custom," says the Pope, "consists of disemboweling and dismembering the corpse, or chopping it to pieces

and then boiling it, so as to remove the flesh before sending the bones home for burial." The bodies of Louis IX of France, and of the German Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, had been shipped home in this way, and the practice had become prevalent towards the close of the thirteenth century. The Pope stigmatized this custom as "revolting" and "abominable," and forbade it henceforth under penalty of excommunication.

This law in no way hindered the practice of dissection, which was prevalent throughout the century in the medical schools of Venice, Pisa, Naples, Bologna, Florence, Rome, Montpellier and Paris (Walsh, *The Popes and Science*, 28-88).

66. Did not Pope Calixtus III in 1456 issue a Bull against Halley's comet ?

No, there is no record of any such Bull. This legend was invented by Laplace (*Reseau Philosophique*), who later on acknowledged that it had no foundation in fact. Nevertheless it has been repeated in various forms by Arago, Smyth, Grant, Flammarion, Babinet, Daru, Chambers, Draper, White and others.

67. All Christians agree on fundamentals. What does it matter if we differ on minor points ?

It surely matters much if you believe Christ when He teaches one thing, and do not believe Him when He teaches another. Remember that His final command to His Church was "...teach all nations...teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. 16-20. Cf. Luke, x. 16).

68. Is not the "bond of charity" (John xiii. 34, 35) sufficient to unite men in the fellowship of Christ, without our bothering about dogmas and creeds ?

No, it is not, for St. Paul declares that "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6), and he always bases love on the unity of faith. He writes: "Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv. 3, 6).

69. Was not the bond of unity broken at the time of the Great Western Schism (1378-1417) ?

No, it was not, for the election of Pope Urban VI was canonically valid, as Catholic (Hefele, Hergenröther, Pastor, Kirsch, Denifle), and non-Catholic (Leo, Hinschius, Siebeking), scholars maintain. The true Papal succession was carried on all during the schism through Urban VI's legitimate successors,

Boniface IX (1389-1404), Innocent VII (1404-1406) and Gregory XII (1406-1415). The official list of the Popes in the *Gerarchia Cattolica* of 1904 omits all mention of the Avignon or Pisan Popes—Clement VII, Benedict XIII and Alexander V—and in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries the names of the Avignon Popes were used a second time (Clement VII, 1523-1534; Benedict XIII, 1724-1730).

According to St. Thomas (IIa. IIæ., Q. 39, art. 1) "schismatics properly so called are those who WILLINGLY and INTENTIONALLY separate themselves from the unity of the Church," as Cerularius in Constantinople in 1053, and Henry VIII in England in 1534. It is probable that Clement VII and the worldly-minded French Cardinals who elected him were schismatics in the real sense, but I doubt if during the whole period of the schism the total number of real schismatics numbered more than one hundred. It is true that Urban VI, immediately after his election, gave just cause for complaint by his arbitrary conduct and his violent temper, but that did not justify the seceding Cardinals in declaring his election invalid. For months they had recognized him as legitimate Pope, assisting at his enthronement at St. John Lateran's and his coronation at St. Peter's, asking numerous favours at his hands, and officially announcing his election to the six absent Cardinals at Avignon, several Spanish Bishops, the Emperor, the French King, Charles V, the Elector Palatine, and the Count of Flanders.

The election of Urban VI had taken place under circumstances so peculiar that, once his electors had renounced their allegiance, it was practically impossible for outsiders to know the real facts in the case. The nations divided on political lines, England and Flanders acknowledging the Italian, while France, Scotland and Spain adhered to the French Popes. It was in reality, as Pastor states, "nothing but the conflict of two nations for the possession of the Papacy; the Italians wished to recover it and the French would not let it be wrested from them" (*History of the Popes*, i., 146). Theologians, canonists and even saints divided on national lines, St. Catherine of Siena acknowledging Urban VI, and St. Vincent Ferrer upholding Clement VII.

Catholics readily admit that the Great Schism shook the authority of the Church to its very foundations, and prepared the way for the sixteenth century revolt (Pastor, *ibid.*, i., 142), but at the same time they regard it as a manifest proof of the divine character of the Papacy. "What human institution could have withstood this trial?" asks de Maistre (*Du Pape*, iv.).

70. What do you mean by the holiness of the Church, and why do you claim that she alone has that distinguishing mark ?

Holiness implies nearness to God, the Author and Source of all holiness (Isa. vi. 3; Apoc. iv. 8). For this reason the Bible calls certain places holy, because God has specially blessed them (Exod. iii. 5; Matt. iv. 5); certain things holy, because they have been dedicated to divine worship (Exod. xxix. 29; Heb. ix. 2); and certain persons holy, because they are closely united to God by charity (Tob. ii. 12; Rom. i. 7; Apoc. v. 3).

The Catholic Church is holy, because her Founder, Jesus Christ, is God, the Infinite Source of all holiness. He alone could confidently challenge His enemies: "Which of you shall convince Me of sin?" (John viii. 46). The founders of the other churches—Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Wesley—and of other religions—Gotama, Mahomet—were but men.

The Catholic Church is holy, because of her intimate union with Christ as His Bride (Eph. v. 23-32) and His Mystical Body (1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. i. 22; iv. 11; v. 30). Catholics are a "chosen people" and a "holy nation," because they are branches of the true Vine, Christ Jesus (John xv. 5). Although men outside her fold may, through invincible ignorance, be members of the Church in desire, and thus share in her divine life, their churches are but "withered branches, that do not abide in Him" (John xv. 1-6).

The Catholic Church is holy, not because there are no sinners in her fold (Matt. xiii. 24-30, 47, 48,) but because her one aim is to produce sanctity. "Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it that He might sanctify it... that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 25-27). The ideal she presents to the world is identical with Christ's: "Be you therefore perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). She has ever taught infallibly the entire Gospel of Christ, for she wished her children to possess "this mind which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. ii. 5). She has ever infallibly given her children the means of grace instituted by Christ in the Mass and the seven Sacraments, whereby the Precious Blood of Christ shed upon the Cross is applied for our sanctification and redemption.

The virtues of Catholics are in exact proportion to their faithful acceptance of her doctrines, their faithful observance of her commandments and counsels, their faithful attendance at holy Mass, and their frequent reception of her Sacraments.

The sinners within her fold, at whom outsiders often point the finger of scorn, are beyond question those very Catholics who disobey her laws, and neglect her Sacraments.

The Catholic Church is holy in her saints. For from the days of the proto-martyr, St. Stephen (Acts vii. 58), to St. Thérèse of Lisieux, the Catholic Church has been the faithful mother of saints. A body of critical scholars, the Bollandists, have been busy since 1643, transcribing their marvellous lives in some sixty four folio volumes (Delehaye, *The Work of the Bollandists*). They have died for Christ as St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Polycarp, St. Agnes and St. Cecilia; they have won whole nations to Christ, like St. Patrick, St. Boniface, St. Ansgar, St. Method and St. Francis Xavier; they have founded religious orders of men and women that won countless souls to the perfect following of the evangelical counsels like St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Madeleine Barat; they have given up everything this life holds dear to care for the sick (St. Camillus), the poor (St. Vincent de Paul), the prisoner among the Moslem (St. John of Matha, St. Felix of Valois); they have valiantly defended the faith in every part of the world (St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Thomas Aquina, St. Canisius); they have counselled Popes (St. Catherine of Siena), and led their country to victory against an alien foe (St. Jeanne d'Arc); they have revealed the inmost secrets of the world of spirit (St. Teresa of Avila, St. John of the Cross).

The Catholic Church is holy, because, like Christ and the Apostles, she has always worked miracles to confirm her claim as their divine representative until the end of the world. Christ Himself gives the lie to non-Catholics who hold that miracles ended with the Apostles. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in My name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues ... they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover" (Mark xvi. 18). No honest inquirer can rightly question the miracles wrought every year at Lourdes through our Lady's intercession, for no court in the world so carefully weighs the proofs for an alleged miracle as the *Bureau des Condémnationes* of that city (Bertrin, *Lourdes*; Grandmaison, *Twenty Cures at Lourdes*; Le Bec, *Medical Proof of the Miraculous*; Merchand, *The Facts of Lourdes*).

We readily admit that there are many devout souls outside the Catholic Church, as every priest who has had much experience with converts can bear witness. Their good lives were not due to their heresy or schism, but to the grace of God, who "will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the

truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). They had not sinned against the light, but had acted like St. Paul, "ignorantly and in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 3). Once within the fold, they realized that the Catholic Church alone was the one *divine* school of sanctity.

71. If your Church is a holy Church, why do you allow adulterers, drunkards and corrupt politicians to be members in good standing ?

Because the Church is the universal Kingdom of God, divinely commissioned to teach Christ's Gospel to all men—sinner and saint, rich and poor, cultured and uncultured—alike. The Church is not a Church of the elect, as Wyclif taught, or Calvin; nor is she an exclusive club for the outwardly respectable and the well-to-do.

Sinners are rarely excommunicated from her fold, and only for some flagrant sin, just as traitors and convicted criminals are debarred by the State from citizenship. The adulterer, the drunkard or the corrupt politician is not in "good standing," for he is not permitted to receive Communion, until he manifests a heartfelt sorrow for his sins in the Sacrament of Penance.

Christ came into the world for sinners: The angel Gabriel said to Mary: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). Christ Himself said: "The Son of Man is come to save that which is lost" (Matt. xviii. 11). "I am not come to call the just, but sinners" (Matt. ix. 13). In spite of His conscious pre-eminence as the sinless Son of God, our Lord spent His life by choice among the poor and ignorant, without ever humbling them by His condescension. One of the signs whereby He was to be recognized as the Messiah was the fact that He was to preach "the Gospel to the poor" (Matt. xi. 5).

Christ always speaks of the Church as a Society composed of the good and the wicked. He compares it to a field in which cockle grows with the wheat (Matt. xiii. 24-30); to a net containing good and bad fishes (Matt. xii. 47); to a barn containing chaff as well as wheat (Matt. iii. 12); to wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-12). St. Paul also speaks of a "great house having vessels not only of gold and silver, but also of wood and earth; or honour and dishonour" (2 Tim. ii. 20).

72. Will you not admit that many of your Popes, Bishops and priests have been wicked men ? Can you call such a Church holy ?

The Church remains holy, no matter how many of her leaders

prove faithless to the Gospel they preach, for these men are cut off from the Church's life by their sins, which can never be traced to her teachings or laws. Would you call an apple tree bad, because you discovered some rotten apples lying on the ground beneath it? No, you judge the tree by the ripening or ripe apples on its boughs. Wicked churchmen will one day have to render a strict account to Almighty God for their stewardship, for as Christ said: "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him much will be required" (Luke xii. 16).

Out of a long line of worthy Popes, seventy-six of whom are reckoned among the saints, only a few were unworthy of their high office, such as John XII (955-964), Benedict IX (1024-1032), and Alexander VI (1492-1503). But the proportion of unworthy Apostles was one out of twelve. No world dynasty can be compared from the standard of virtue with our illustrious dynasty of two hundred and sixty-two Popes.

Is it fair to be ever citing the evil lives of the minority, when all admit that the majority of clerics have ever been faithful to God and the things of God?

73. Why are Catholic nations less prosperous than Protestant ones?

Jesus Christ never made material prosperity a mark of His true Church; He never declared worldly success a sign of the divine favour. On the contrary, He is so outspoken against the sins incident to riches, that some unthinking socialists have claimed Him for their own.

Material prosperity is no guarantee of the divine favour, for otherwise the Unchangeable God would be as changeable as His creatures. Did God sanction the idolatry of pagan Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece or Rome in the days of their political prosperity? Did God declare the religion of the Jews false when they were slaves under Pharaoh, or Christianity untrue when the early Christians were persecuted to the death by the mighty, prosperous Romans?

A criterion that works both ways is evidently false. Did God sanction the Catholicism of Spain in the days when Philip II ruled the world and does He reject it to-day when Spain has lost most of her colonies and her moneys? Did God sanction the Protestantism of Holland in the seventeenth century when she fought England as an equal, and did the carrying trade of Europe, and does He denounce it to-day, because she has lost her rank among the first-class powers?

No, material prosperity has nothing to do with a nation's

religion. It never is a sign of God's favour. A country's progress and development depend on the fertility of its soil, the wealth of its mines of gold, silver, coal, copper and iron; on the inventions of machinery, steam and electricity; on the energy and industry of its people. A pagan can make money out of a large wheat farm as well as a Catholic; a Jew can make a fortune out of an oil-well as well as a Protestant.

Cardinal Newman thus answers this objection: "The world believes in the world's ends as the greatest of goods; it wishes society to be governed entirely for the sake of this world. Provided it could gain one little islet in the ocean, one foot upon the coast, at the cost of a hundred lives and a hundred souls, it would think it a very good bargain. . . . The world-wide Church, like her Divine Founder, regards, consults for, labours for the individual soul; she looks at the souls for whom Christ died, and who are made over to her, and her one object, for which everything is sacrificed, is to acquit herself well of this awful responsibility. . . . Not till the State is blamed for not making saints, may it be fairly laid to the fault of the Church that she cannot invent a steam engine or construct a tariff." (*Anglican Difficulties*).

74. Why do you apply the term "Catholic", exclusively to your Church ?

Because our Church alone is Catholic or universal in time, doctrine and extent. She has existed in perfect continuity from the time of Christ and will last until His Second Coming. She teaches all His gospel, and administers all His divine means of salvation. She is not confined to any particular region or nation, but is widespread among all the nations of the world. The word Catholic does not denote a quality. One cannot be Anglo, Eastern or Liberal Catholic; one cannot be more or less Catholic. One either is a Catholic or he is not.

The Eastern schismatics are not Catholic in time, for they date only from the fifth (the Lesser Eastern Churches) or from the eleventh century (the Orthodox Eastern Church). The Protestant churches are not Catholic in time because they date from the sixteenth (Lutherans and Anglicans), the seventeenth (Baptists), the eighteenth (Methodists), or the nineteenth century (the Disciples of Christ). The outside churches are not Catholic in faith, because they have broken away from the centre of unity, the Roman See, and question many of Christ's laws and doctrines. They are not Catholic in extent, for, from the beginning of their secession, they have identified

themselves with some particular nation—Germany, the Scandinavian countries, England, Russia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Serbia, Greece.

Mere profession of a Creed does not constitute one a Catholic, for the different separatist churches read into it their own peculiar opinions. A number of different sects scattered all over the world do not constitute a Catholic Church. Catholicism implies a divine unity of government, faith and worship.

The Old Testament in many a passage prophesied that the Church of the Messiah would be a universal Kingdom (Gen. xii. 3; Ps. ii. 8; xxi. 8; lxii. 11; lxxi. 8; lxxxv. 2; Isa. ii. 9; ix. 7; lix. 5; Dan. ii. 35; vii. 26; Mal. i. 10, 11; Zach. ix. 10).

The New Testament always contrasts the universality of the New Law with the national character of the Old. It is true that Christ and the Apostles first preached to the Jews. "He came unto His own" (John i. 11). "Go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x. 6). But our Lord reminds the Jews time and time again that the kingdom He is about to establish is a world-wide Kingdom, both in time and in extent. When He heals the centurion's servant, He prophesies that the Gentile multitudes "shall come from the East and the West" into His Church (Matt. viii. 11). He tells the Samaritan woman: "The hour cometh, when you shall neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father" (John iv. 21). In His parables He speaks of the Sower "whose field is the world" and "whose harvest is the end of the world" (Matt. xiii. 38, 39), and of the Jewish Vineyard, which shall be transferred to other, *i. e.*, Gentile husbandmen" (Matt. xxi. 41, 43). Before His Resurrection He declares that "the Gospel is to be preached in the whole world" and "unto all nations" (Matt. xxiv. 14; xxvi. 13; Mark xiii. 10; xiv. 9), and after it, He gives a universal commission to His Apostles: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations." "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47).

The early Fathers often declare that the Church is Catholic, because it is spread over the whole earth, and teaches everywhere "universally and completely all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge" (St. Cyril, *Catecheses*, xviii., 23; *Cf.* St. Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii., 17; Origen, *Cont. Celsum*, ii., 13; *In Num.*, xii.; St. Optatus, *De Schis. Don.*, ii., 1). The teaching of St. Augustine may be studied in the

two volumes of Batiffol's *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin*. After mentioning various reasons why he is a Catholic St. Augustine writes: "The name itself of the Catholic Church keeps me, a name which in the midst of so many heresies this Church alone has, not without cause, so held possession of, that, although all heretics would fain have themselves called Catholics, yet to the inquiry of any stranger, 'Where is the assembly of the Catholic Church held?', no heretic would dare point out his own basilica or house" (*Contr. Epis. Manichæi Fund.*, 5).

The Catholic Church is Catholic in extent, outnumbering any one sect; in fact, she is greater than all of them together. A Protestant writer in the *American Encyclopedia* gives the following statistics: Catholics, 294,583,999; Protestants, 194,102,000, and Eastern Schismatics, 120,729,000. The Vatican Missionary Exposition in 1927 gave the following figures: Catholics, 305,000,000; Protestants, 220,000,000, and Eastern Schismatics, 158,000,000. Mere numbers, of course, would not constitute Catholicity, but the Church's *de facto* numerical superiority points to *de jure* Catholicity,—her universal divine commission to spread the one faith among all nations.

75. Does not the title "Roman Catholic" localize your Church as one of the branches of the Church universal?

The name Catholic as a name is not applied to the Catholic Church in the Bible, although the idea of the Church in the mind of Christ and the Apostles is clearly set forth by this Greek word, which means "universal." St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Christians of Smyrna about the year 110, is the first to use the name "The Catholic Church." He writes: "Where the Bishop is, there let the multitude of believers be; even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church" (*Ad. Smyr.*, vii., 2). *The Martyrdom of St. Polycarp* (155) mentions "The Catholic Church" in three passages (viii., 1; xvi., 2; xix., 2). At the beginning of the third century, as Father d'Herbigny says, "The dogmatic sense of the word 'Catholic' is evident; the true Church is the Church that is called Catholic" (*De Ecclesia*, ii., 72). He cites Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, vii., 18), Origen (*In Jos.*, ix., 8), among the Greeks, the Muratorian Fragment (200) and Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion*, iv., 4; *De Præs.*, xxx.) among the Latins. In this last passage Tertullian speaks of the "Catholica" when he means the Church. St. Augustine uses the same word

as a synonym of the Church 240 times (*Revue Benedictine*, 1900, 1-9).

The term "Roman Catholic" does not localize the Church, for it can be explained in an orthodox sense, as the Catholic Church whose centre is Rome. In like manner people speak of the Washington Government, meaning the United States, whose centre is Washington.

Catholics object to this term, because of its origin, its heretical intent, and its novelty. It was first introduced by Protestant controversialists in England, who keenly resented our claim to a monopoly of the name "Catholic" (Thurston, *Month*, Sept., Oct., 1911). It became general in legal and governmental circles during the seventeenth century in England, and has been used in a heretical sense of a branch Church ever since by the English government. For this reason the English Bishops protested against the term at the Vatican Council in 1870. The Church's official title is "The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church"; in no official document has it ever styled itself "The Roman Catholic Church."

76. You claim that your Church alone is Apostolic. We believe it to be a corruption of the primitive Church, and that Luther by sending us to the Bible for our religion, restored the Church to its primitive purity.

Apostolicity implies that the true Church is the Church which Christ commissioned His Apostles to establish under the supremacy of St. Peter. He Himself chose the twelve Apostles, made St. Peter their head, and commissioned them to transmit infallibly all His divine revelation to all nations till the end of the world (Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark iii. 13; Luke vi. 13; John vi. 71; xv. 16; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15, 17; Matt. xxviii. 18; Mark xvi. 15; Luke x. 16; John xiv. 16).

The true church is Apostolic in origin, doctrine and ministry. The true Church must trace its origin in unbroken line to Jesus and the twelve Apostles. Before giving His divine commission to the Apostles, Christ insists upon His divine commission from His heavenly Father. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you" (John xxi. 21). "The very works that I do bear witness to Me that the Father hath sent Me" (John v. 36). "All power is given Me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19). No individual has the right to associate himself with the Apostles; he must be "sent" or "commissioned" with divine authority. "How shall they preach," asks St. Paul, "unless they be sent?" (Rome. x. 15).

A comparison may make this clear. If, for example, a body of twelve men receive from the owner of a large wheat farm the contract to gather in the whole harvest, they receive at the same time the right to hire as many other workers as are necessary to fulfill their contract. But no one can lawfully work in the field expecting payment, unless he has been empowered to do so by one of the twelve, or some one else acting in their name and with their authority. So the Lord of the harvest (Luke x. 1-12) has given the harvesting of the nations to the twelve Apostles and their legitimate successors until His Second Coming. No intruder or usurper outside the legitimate successors can have any jurisdiction. A break with the past proves that Apostolicity of origin has been lost. As our lord put it: "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber" (John x. 1).

Apostolicity of origin is proof of Apostolicity of doctrine. God's Church cannot become corrupt, because He has promised to preserve it from error: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi. 18). "I am with you all days" (Matt. xxviii. 20). "The Holy Spirit will abide with you forever" (John xiv. 16).

Apostolicity of ministry implies the authority to teach, to rule and to sanctify, which has been handed down from the Apostles. Valid Orders alone do not guarantee an Apostolic ministry, for they may be conferred by men who are in heresy and schism. Valid Orders must be accompanied by legitimate jurisdiction, which comes only through union with the head of the Apostolic body, the See of Peter.

The only Church that can rightly claim that its origin is not due to a break with the past is the Catholic Church. The Eastern Churches broke with the past and lost the Apostolic succession when Cerularius was excommunicated by the Papal legates in 1054. The continental Protestants broke with the Apostolic Church at the time of Luther's revolt in 1520, and the English Protestants in 1559, when the State made Parker the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury.

When the early Fathers wished to use a most convincing argument to prove the true Church, they always appealed to the fact of its Apostolic origin. We often find them compiling authentic lists of the legitimate Bishops, especially with regard to the Apostolic See of Rome. As early as the second century we find the Syrian Hegesippus and the Greek Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, maintaining that the source and standard of the faith is the Apostolic tradition handed down in an unbroken succession

of Bishops. "But it would be too long to enumerate here the series of all the Churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to by episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all, known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter" (*Adv. Her.*, iii., 3; Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iv., 8).

77. Is not the Church of England and her offshoot, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, continuous and identical with the Church in England prior to the Reformation ?

No, the continuity theory of modern High Churchmen is a myth, for the Established Church of England which dates from Elizabeth differs totally in government, doctrine and worship from the Catholic Church. No English King or Bishop prior to the Reformation ever denied the primacy of the Pope.

The Archbishops of Canterbury, primates of the English Church, were never recognized until their appointment had been confirmed by the Pope. When consecrated and invested with the pallium, which the Pope always sent them as a symbol of their rightful jurisdiction in union with him, the Church's supreme head, they swore "to defend the Roman Papacy against all men, to obey the commands of the Holy See with their whole strength, and to cause them to be obeyed by others" (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii., 305). In their letters they continually style themselves the "legates of the Holy See," and declare "their service and obedience" to the Pope.

The English Bishops before the Reformation were never recognized without the Pope's confirmation, and as a rule were directly appointed by him. The oath taken at their consecration ran as follows: "I will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, to the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, to my Lord Pope N—and his successors canonically entering, . . . I will give aid, saving my order, to defend and to maintain against every man the Papacy of the Roman Church and the Royalty of St. Peter. . . . So may God help me and these holy Gospels." Rome was always the supreme court of appeal in all important trials (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii., 315). The Kings of England always recognized the Pope's supremacy in the matter of episcopal appointments, the granting of dispensations in the prohibited degrees, the receiving of Papal legates, and the accepting of Papal interdicts and excommunications.

All the disagreements between England and Rome prior to

the Reformation were concerned with temporal, and not spiritual matters. For example William the Conqueror (1066-1087), while fully acknowledging the primacy of Gregory VII (1073-1085), refused, as he had a perfect right, to do feudal homage for his kingdom (Rivington, *Rome and England*, 39-50). Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (1235-1253), is often brought forward by controversialists as an anti-Papal bishop but his letters edited by Luard of Trinity, express the greatest reverence for the Pope, and prove his firm belief in the Pope's supreme jurisdiction.

Edward III's Statute of Provisors (1351) which made the obtaining of an English benefice on provision of the Pope against the rights of patrons, an offence punishable by fine and imprisonment, and the statute of *Præmunire* (1353) which outlawed all who sued in a foreign court in matters cognizable in the King's court, do not prove that the Church of fourteenth century England was anti-Papal. This is admitted by non-Catholic historians. Tout of Manchester writes: "The anti-Papal laws of the fourteenth century were acts of the secular and not of the ecclesiastical power. . . . The clergyman, though his soul grew indignant against the curialists, still believed that the Pope was the divinely appointed autocrat of the Church universal. Being a man, a Pope might be a bad Pope, but the faithful Christian could not but obey in the last resort. The Papacy was so essentially interwoven with the whole Church of the Middle Ages, that few figments have less historical basis than the notion that there was an anti-Papal Anglican Church in the days of the Edwards" (*Political History of England*, iii., 379).

For the sixth to the sixteenth century the Catholic Church in England flourished and grew, in union with the divine centre of unity, the Pope.

Under Henry VIII (1509-1547), England for the first time in her history denied the supremacy of the Pope, and thereby lapsed into schism. This grossly immoral Tudor despot, after trying in vain to persuade Pope Clement VII (1529-1534) to annul his valid marriage with Catherine of Aragon, determined to take the matter into his own hands. On January 25, 1533, he was married privately to his mistress, Anne Boleyn, by one of the Court chaplains without even the pretence of a divorce. Henry chose a married priest, Thomas Cranmer, to be Archbishop of Canterbury, deceiving the Pope, who would never have sent the bulls, had he been aware of his marriage and of his Protestant views. Within seven weeks (May 17) this time-serving apostate

obediently declared Henry's marriage with Catherine null and void—forsooth to satisfy "the conscience of the King." Two years later he was just as willing to declare Henry's marriage with Anne invalid, for had not Henry, who now wished to marry Jane Seymour, seduced Anne's sister Mary? In November, 1634, a subservient Parliament enacted that "the King, his heirs and successors, should be taken and reputed *the only supreme heads on earth of the Church of England*, with full power to visit, reform and correct all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts and enormities, which by any manner of *spiritual* authority ought to be reformed and corrected."

Most of the cowardly English bishops proved recreant to their trust, and the new nobility, enriched by the plunder of the Church lands, followed Henry in his schism. Saints like Sir Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher, together with some Franciscans and Carthusians, went gladly to the scaffold rather than acknowledge the King's supremacy in spirituals. "I cannot conform my conscience," said More, "to the counsel of one kingdom against the general consent of Christendom."

Under the boy King Edward VI, a mere puppet in the hands of the Somersets and Cranmer, the English Church, which in her outward appearance had remained unchanged under Henry became out-and-out Protestant. The First Book of Common Prayer (1549), compiled by Cranmer and his Protestant confreres from the Sarum Missal and the Lutheran office books, was made compulsory throughout England by the Act of Uniformity. The Latin breviary and the missal were superseded by an English prayer book, which was intended to do away with the Mass, and the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Fines and imprisonment were imposed upon all clerics and laymen who did not at once hand over all the old Catholic liturgical books, and the King's Council ordered all altars to be destroyed in the churches, and tables set up in their stead. The Protestant Bishop Ridley, who had been given Bishop Bonner's See of London, at once proceeded to pull down the high altar in St. Paul's, while he ordered his clergy "to use only the ceremonies and gestures in the Book of Common Prayer and none other, so that there do not appear in them any counterfeiting of the Popish Mass." But even this book proved too "high" for the Swiss Reformers, who urged Cranmer to make a more drastic revision, which completely obliterated the slightest trace of the Catholic Mass. The Second Prayer Book of 1552 omitted every prayer which could possibly suggest the divine Sacrifice for the living and the dead.

In 1550 Cranmer compiled a new Ordinal, which deliberately and intentionally excluded a priesthood capable of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. As Pope Leo XIII says: "The history of that time is sufficiently eloquent of the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church; as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from heterodox sects; and as to the end in view; . . . Under a pretext of returning to the primitive form, they corrupted the liturgical order in many ways to suit the errors of the Reformers. For this reason, in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the Sacrifice, but every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. . . . Once a new rite has been initiated, in which the Sacrament of Orders is adulterated and denied, and from which all idea of Consecration and Sacrifice has been rejected, the formula 'Receive the Holy Spirit' no longer holds good, and so the words 'For the office and work of a bishop,' and the like no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted" (Bull on Anglican Orders).

In 1552 Cranmer compiled the ultra-Protestant Forty-Two Articles, which Edward VI approved, and ordered all churchwardens, schoolmasters and clergymen to sing. He also drew up a code of ecclesiastical laws, which abolished the Roman canon law in England, and although its publication was prevented by the death of the King, it reveals to us the anti-Catholic spirit of the leading Reformers.

Under Queen Mary (1553-1558) the English Parliament, which had repudiated the Papacy under Henry VIII, and had decided upon a new national religion with its heretical service books under Edward VI, passed bills rejecting the Protestantism of Henry VIII and Edward VI. The Reformed liturgy which four years before the English Parliament had declared "inspired by the Holy Ghost," it now declared "a new thing, imagined and devised by a few singular opinions."

When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, England was again a Catholic country in full communion with Rome. She had professed herself a convert to the Catholic faith under Mary, but her ministers, with the clever but unscrupulous Cecil at the head—he too had gone to Mass under Mary—had little difficulty in persuading her "to put down a religion which proclaimed her a bastard, and to support the reformed doctrines, which alone could give stability to her throne." In 1559 her first Parliament passed the Act of Supremacy, which declared the

Queen "supreme governor in all things spiritual and temporal." All the Catholic bishops—there were sixteen at the time—with the one exception of Kitchen of Llandaff, steadfastly refused to take this sacrilegious oath, and were at once deprived of their sees. Two died in exile, one died in his home, and the other twelve were imprisoned until their death. In December, Elizabeth had Parker invalidly consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury by the defective Ordinal of Edward VI, and the Catholic bishops were replaced by invalidly consecrated Calvinistic laymen like Grindal, Jewel, Cox, Sandys, Parkhurst, Pilkington and others. In this way, in virtue of her civil authority alone, Elizabeth created and organized her own Church, the Protestant Established Church of England, which broke completely with the old religion which had from the sixth century been united with the centre of Christian unity, Rome. The only continuity apparent was a continuity of the titles of the old Catholic sees, and the possession of some of the temporalities connected with the old bishoprics.

Parliament also passed the Act of Uniformity (1559), made the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI the church's official Prayer Book, and forbade under penalties any absence from the new Protestant services. The altars were again destroyed, and the Mass proscribed. In 1563 the Forty-Two Articles of Edward VI were revised and cut down to the Thirty-nine Articles, that still form the groundwork of the Protestant creed of the Church of England.

Is it not strange, that some men of that church which for hundreds of years gloried in its Protestantism, and persecuted to the death five hundred martyrs who professed loyalty to the Pope and love for the Mass, should to-day repudiate the Reformation, and attempt to defend the unreal, unhistorical myth of continuity. As Cardinal Bourne well said in his Pastoral Letter for Lent, 1928: "No one who has really studied and understood the history of the English martyrs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can honestly maintain that there is any real continuity between the Elizabethan Church still legally established in this country, and the Catholic Church set up among us by St. Augustine in 597, of which we Catholics, in union with the Apostolic See, are the sole legitimate representatives to-day."

VI. THE POPE.

78. What proofs can you offer that St. Peter was ever in Rome?

The proofs are so many and so overwhelming that many

non-Catholic scholars, Protestants and Rationalists alike, have admitted this fact without question. I mention about twenty in England, France and Germany: Bleck, Cave, Credner, Cludius, De Wette, Grotius, Hales, Hilgenfeld, Lardner, Macknight, Mangold, Meyer, Mynster, Neander, Renan, Steiger, Wieseler, Whiston and Whitby.

Cave writes: "That Peter was at Rome, and held the See there for some time, we fearlessly affirm with the whole multitude of the ancients. We give witnesses above all exception, derived from most remote antiquity." And he proceeds to quote St. Ignatius, Papias, St. Irenæus, Dionysius of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Caius of Rome and Origen (*Historia Literaria*, i.).

Dr. Lardner writes: "It is the general, uncontradicted, disinterested testimony of ancient writers in the several parts of the world—Greeks, Latins, Syrians" (*History of the Apostles*, ch. xviii.).

Whiston writes: "That St. Peter was at Rome is so clear in Christian antiquity that it is a shame for any Protestant to confess that any Protestant ever denied it" (*Memoirs*).

Pearson writes: "Since it has been handed down from almost the beginning that St. Peter preached the Gospel in Rome, and there suffered martyrdom, and since no one has ever affirmed that either Peter or Paul was crowned with martyrdom elsewhere, I think, with full security, faith may be given to this account. For who would believe that so great an Apostle could have died in such obscurity as that no one ever recorded the place of his death?" (*Minor Theological Works*, iii., 34).

The fact that Peter was in Rome is proved from the Sacred Scriptures, for the Epistle of St. Peter was written from Babylon, *i. e.*, Rome. Babylon, the city of iniquity, spoken of by the prophets (Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. ii. 8) was figuratively used for Rome in Apostolic times, as we learn from St. John (Apoc. xiv. 8; xiv. 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 21). In the fourth century we find both Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, 15) and St. Jerome (*De Viris Ill.*) declaring that St. Peter by "Babylon" means Rome.

This is admitted by fair-minded Protestants. Elliott's, *Speaker's Commentary*, thus comments on 1 Peter v. 13: "We have to remark that the city of Babylon was certainly not the seat of a Christian community; that no ancient record has the slightest trace of St. Peter's presence or work in Chaldea; that all ancient authorities are unanimous in asserting that the later years of his life were passed in the west of the Roman Empire. On the other hand Babylon was well known in Asia Minor

during the lifetime of St. John as the symbolical designation of Rome . . . Accordingly, we find an absolute consensus of ancient interpreters that there Babylon must be understood as equivalent to Rome." He then cites Thiersch, Ewald and Hilgenfeld, who held the same view.

The Fathers of the first four centuries frequently speak of the labours of St. Peter in Rome and his martyrdom there. St. Clement (*Ad Cor.*, v.) in 97; St. Ignatius (*Ad Rom.*, iv.) in 107; Clement of Alexandria (*In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 14) in 190; St. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3) in 178; the Roman presbyter Caius (*In Eusebius, Hist. Eccles.*, ii., 25) in 214. Many others can be cited, such as Origen, St. Cyprian, Firmilian, Arnobius, St. Epiphanius, and St. Dionysius of Corinth.

Another strong proof of St. Peter's presence in Rome is drawn from the study of archæology. Professor Lanciani writes: "For the Archæologist the presence and execution of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome are facts established beyond the shadow of a doubt by purely monumental evidence. There is no event of the imperial age which is attested by so many noble structures."

79. Is there any Biblical proof that Christ made Peter the first Pope? Were not all the Apostles equal?

The Catholic Church believes that St. Peter was the chief Apostle, exercising by Christ's appointment the supreme power of governing His Church. The Vatican Council says: "If any one says that Christ the Lord did not constitute the Blessed Peter prince of all the Apostles and head of the whole church militant; or if he says that this Primacy is one of mere honor and not of real jurisdiction received directly and immediately from our Lord Jesus, let him be anathema."

On three different occasions Christ speaks of the primacy of St. Peter over the twelve Apostles.

1. After St. Peter had acknowledged His divinity, Christ promised him a reward in the following words: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18, 19).

a. The metaphor of the rock is easily understood. Christ the Rock, the Chief Corner Stone of the Church (Eph. ii. 20; Matt. xxi. 42), promises to make Peter the rock, on which

His Church (1 Cor. iii. 9) is to be built. He is addressing him alone ("I say to *thee*"), not the other Apostles. Our Lord has in mind the wise man of His own parable (Matt. vii. 24). The rock foundation of a building gives it unity, strength and stability; it holds all the various parts of the building solidly together. In a society this is effected by the authority of the head, by whom unity is forever preserved.

b. Christ then gives the reason why He intends to build His Church upon the Rock, Peter, *viz.*, "that the gates of hell may never prevail against it." Whether hell means the hell of the damned or the realm of death, the meaning is obvious. The Church of Christ is to withstand forever the attacks of every foe within or without her fold.

c. The symbol of the keys, in the East, always implied power and authority, and the giving of the keys the transfer of that authority. When Eliacim was appointed over the palace in the place of Sobna, we read: "I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Isa. xxii. 22; Cf. Apoc. i. 18; iii. 7).

d. "Binding and loosing" among the Rabbis of our Lord's time meant to declare something "prohibited" or "permitted." Here it plainly means that St. Peter, the Steward of the Lord's house, the Church, has all the rights and powers of a divinely appointed steward. He does not, like the Jewish Rabbis, declare probable, speculative opinions, but he has the right to teach and govern authoritatively, with the certainty of God's approval "in heaven." The member of the Church that refuses to obey is to be regarded as "a heathen and a publican," as Christ says in a similar passage (Matt. xviii. 17). A lawgiving power is certainly implied by these words.

2. The night before He died Jesus said to St. Peter "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Luke xxii. 31, 32). Satan had desired to try the Apostle, as once he tried the patriarch Job (i. 11, 12). Christ tells St. Peter that, although He prayed for all the Apostles (John xvii. 9), He prayed especially for him (Luke xxii. 31), that he might strengthen the others. Christ prophesies that St. Peter will one day say that he did not know Jesus, but not that he would deny Him as the Messiah and the son of God (Matt. xxvi. 72). Just as the "Church, therefore, is the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15), so St. Peter is the strengthener of the faith of his brethren.

The promise in St. Luke corresponds perfectly with our Lord's promise in Matthew. Simon is the security of the Church against Satan and the powers of hell in both cases ; he is the solid rock on which the Church is to be built.

3. After the Resurrection, Christ bestowed upon St. Peter the primacy He had twice promised. His words are : "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these ? He saith to Him : Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him : Feed My lambs. He saith to him again : Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me ? He saith to Him : Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him : Feed My lambs. He said to him the third time : Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me ? Peter was grieved because He had said to him the third time : Lovest thou Me ? And he said to Him : Lord, Thou knowest all things ; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him : Feed My sheep" (John xxi. 15-17).

The Vatican Council defines as an article of faith that by these words Christ "conferred upon Peter alone the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all the flock."

The three-fold question of our Lord reminds Peter of his former presumption (Matt. xxvi. 33) and his three-fold denial (Matt. xxvi. 75), and tells the other Apostles that Peter's love was indeed greater than theirs. For this reason Christ conferred upon him a higher office. Peter does not boast of his love this time, but he appeals to our Lord's Omniscience as evidence of its reality.

The symbolism is plain. Christ declared Himself the Good Shepherd (John x. 11-16) frequently foretold by the prophets (*Cf.* Ezech. xxxiv. 23 ; xxxvii. 24, 26 ; Zach. xi. 7 ; Jer. iii. 14 ; xxii. 4 ; Isa. xli. 11). As the divine Ruler of the whole flock, He makes Peter the ruler in His place, now that He is to leave this earth and return to His heavenly Father. Christ's supreme power of teaching, judging, and legislating for the flock is delegated to Peter, who is to teach, rule and judge the flock forever with His divine authority.

Indeed the pre-eminence of St. Peter is suggested in many a passage in the New Testament. His name is changed at his first meeting with Christ (John i. 42), thus indicating the office of rock foundation, which was to be given him later on. He is always named first in the lists of the Apostles (Matt. x. 2 ; Mark iii. 16 ; Luke vi. 13, 14), and always regarded as their leader (Matt. xvii. 1, 23-26 ; xxvi. 37-40 ; xiv. 22 ; Mark v. 37 ; ix. 1 ; Luke v. 2-10 ; viii. 45). After the Resurrection he presides at the election of Matthias (Acts i. 22) ; he is the first to preach

the Gospel (Acts ii. 14); he is the first to work miracles (Acts iii. 6); he is the judge of Ananias and Saphira (Acts v. 1-10); he is the first to declare the universality of the Church's mission (Acts x.), and the first to receive a pagan convert (Acts x.); he presides at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.).

80. Granted that Peter was the chief Apostle and head of the Church in the beginning, how can you prove that his power was handed down the centuries?

The Vatican Council teaches as an article of faith that the Pope is the legitimate successor of St. Peter. "If any one says that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in the primacy, let him be anathema."

The primacy of St. Peter was not a personal privilege, like the power of working miracles, but an essential part of Christ's Church, the rock on which it was built. As long as the Church was to last—till the end of the world—Peter was to reign in an unbroken succession of Bishops of Rome. The House of God will always need its *foundation*; the House of God will always need its divinely appointed *steward*; the faithful will always need a *confirmer of the brethren*, and a *shepherd* to guide and rule them.

Some have suggested that the pre-eminence of the Roman Church came from the fact that Rome was the capital of the Empire. But if we consult the divine tradition which ever recognized the Bishops of Rome as the successors of St. Peter, we will never find, except in the schismatical East, the slightest allusion to this false theory. It states unanimously that the Popes held their supreme office for the sole reason that they were St. Peter's successors. That Rome's place in the Empire led to its being chosen by Divine Providence as Peter's see was to be expected.

Many of the documents of early Church history were destroyed during the pagan persecutions of the first three centuries, but ample records remain to show that the Bishops of Rome exercised the supreme power of teaching, ruling and judging. Before St. John died, Pope Clement of Rome (90-99) of his own accord wrote to the Christians of Corinth, urging concord and submission to their ecclesiastical superiors. There is no record of the Apostle John intervening, although Ephesus was easier of access than Rome. The Corinthians accepted Rome's message and legates gladly, and the Pope's letter was placed almost on a level with the Sacred Scriptures for nearly a century (Clement, *Ad. Cor.*, i., 1, 2, 44).

St. Ignatius of Antioch (117) a few years afterwards wrote a letter to the Roman Church, in which he mentions her supremacy. "She presides in the country of the Romans; she presides at the love feasts, or the charities." As Duchesne well says: "Here there is no question of the Bishop, but of the Church. Over what did the Roman Church preside? Was it merely over some other churches, or dioceses, within a limited area? Ignatius had no idea of a limitation of that kind. . . . The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides over all the Churches" (*The Churches Separated from Rome*, 85). She not only ruled, but she taught infallibly the doctrine of Christ, for St. Ignatius adds: "You have never led astray any one; you have taught others" (*Ad Rom.*, iii.).

The Epitaph of Abercius, a Phrygian priest or Bishop of the latter half of the second century, states that "Christ, the Pure Shepherd, sent him to royal Rome to behold it, and to see the golden-robed, golden-slippered queen." This famous stele, tells in mystical language of Baptism, the Eucharist, the universality of the Church as opposed to Montanism, and of the pre-eminence of Rome, which he came from afar to visit, taking "Faith as his guide."

Pope Victor (189-198) at the close of the second century summoned the Bishops of the time to come together in councils to determine the date of celebrating Easter. The Asiatics accepted the Jewish Pasch for their feast, while Rome observed it on the Sunday after the Jewish Pasch. Although the Council of Asia appealed to St. John and St. Philip as their authorities together with Papias and St. Polycarp, the Pope threatened the Bishops with excommunication, unless they abandoned their custom. Could there be a more striking evidence of his realization of his supreme authority? Who but the supreme Bishop would have dared to separate Bishops from the unity of the whole Church? No other Church ever claimed such power.

St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, wrote in 180 his well known treatise against the Gnostics of his time. In it we find a clear assertion of the unity of the Church's teaching, and the supremacy of Rome, the guardian of the Apostolic tradition, over all other churches. He says: "It would be too long to enumerate here the series of all the churches; it suffices to point out the Apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all, known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles,

Paul and Peter.....Indeed, the superior pre-eminence of that Church is such that every church—I mean the faithful of any country whatsoever—necessarily agrees with her, that is, every church in any country in which the Apostolic tradition has been preserved without interruption" (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3).

When the heretical Bishop of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, refused to leave his residence after his deposition, the case was brought before the pagan Emperor Aurelian (270-275). He decided it "most equitably, ordering the building to be given to those to whom the Bishops of Italy and the city of Rome should adjudge it" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vii., 30).

In the year 256 a conflict arose between Pope Stephen (254-257) and St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, on the question of baptisms conferred by heretics. Rome considered these baptisms valid, while Carthage declared them invalid. Despite the fact that St. Cyprian with his Bishops in Council refused to give up his custom, Pope Stephen (254-257) insisted upon the *traditional* teaching, and threatened the opposing Bishops with excommunication, as Pope Victor had done in the Easter controversy.

Neither the African Bishops, nor Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, who held similar views, denied the authority of the Apostolic See. They simply defended their opinion by arguments no one considers theologically sound to-day, falsely believing they were free to follow what they considered a disciplinary custom.

Did not the same St. Cyprian write to Pope Cornelius: "They dare set sail and carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to *the Chair of Peter, the primatial Church, whence the unity of the Church has its rise*" (*Epis.*, lix, 14). Again he wrote Pope Stephen to excommunicate Marcian, Bishop of Arles, for heresy, thus full acknowledging his supreme authority. A liberal critic, Harnack, writes: "Cyprian recognized in the See of Rome a particular importance, because that See was the See of the Apostle on whom Christ conferred especially the Apostolic authority, to manifest thereby with perfect clearness the unity of this authority and the unity of the Church which rested thereon, and because the Church of this See had been the mother and the root of the Catholic Church spread through the world" (*Dogmengeschichte*, i., 384).

The Archbishop of Alexandria, Dionysius (195-265), was accused at Rome of heresy with regard to the Blessed Trinity. Pope Dionysius (259-268) asked him to explain his

words, which he did in his reply to the Pope, and in the four books of his *Refutation and Apology* (Athanasius, *De Sent. Dion.*, 13, 18). The Pope asked him not to reject the term consubstantial, although the word did not become classical until the following century. The Archbishop, in modifying his language, showed that he was really orthodox, and thereby recognized the authority of the Bishop of Rome to call him to account.

One of the most voluminous writers of the third century was Origen of Alexandria (184-254). His many doctrinal errors were condemned at Constantinople in 543, and again at the Fifth General Council in 553. During his lifetime, however, although he had disciplinary troubles with his Bishop, Demetrius, the only Bishop who rebuked him for his doctrinal errors was St. Fabian, Bishop of Rome (236-250; Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, xxxvi., p. 4). Harnack admits that this proves "the voice of Rome seems to have been of special importance" (Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, 328).

After the third century the historical witness to the papal authority is even more abundant.

81. Was there not at one time a female Pope, Johanna?

No, there never was a woman Pope. This fable is mentioned first in the thirteenth century by two Dominicans, John de Mailly and Stephen de Bourbon, who placed her pontificate in 1100, and by the Papal chamberlain, Martin of Troppau who says she was Pope in 855.

The legend was generally accepted during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but from the days of Æneas Sylvius, Pope Pius II (1458-1464) and Platina (*Lives of the Popes*) it has been universally rejected as unhistorical. Protestant and rationalistic scholars alike agree in rejecting it: Bayle, Basnage, Blondel, Burnet, Bochart, Cave, Chamier, Casaubon, Dumoulin, Gibbon, Gieseler, Leibnitz, Mosheim, Neander, De Thou.

Not one historian mentions the woman Pope from the tenth to the thirteenth century, which is good evidence of her never having existed. Chronology settles the question, for the two dates assigned to her pontificate are impossible. Leo IV died July 17, 855, and was immediately succeeded by Pope Benedict III (855-858). We have coins with the images of Pope Benedict III and the Emperor Lothair, who died September 28, 855, and a charter for the Abbey of Corvey issued by Benedict III on October 7, 855. There was no interregnum between these two

Popes. The other date, 1100, is out of the question, as Pope Paschal II reigned from 1099 to 1118.

82. What do Catholics mean by the infallibility of the Pope?

The Vatican Council thus defined the doctrine of Papal infallibility (*On the Church of Christ*, ch. iv.): "Faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith . . . we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised him in the Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith and morals; and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiffs are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."

The Pope, therefore, is infallible only :

1. When he speaks *ex cathedra*, i.e., when he speaks officially as supreme pastor of the universal Church. He is not infallible as supreme legislator, supreme judge or supreme ruler. He is not infallible as a simple priest, local Bishop of Rome, Archbishop of the Roman Province, Primate of Italy, or Patriarch of the West.

2. When he defines a doctrine regarding faith and morals. To define a doctrine means to settle it definitely, finally, irrevocably. To omit to define a doctrine might do incalculable harm or imply culpable neglect on the part of a Pope, but it would not be inconsistent with infallibility.

3. When he speaks of faith and morals, which includes the whole content of divine revelation, or the deposit of faith, as St. Paul calls it (Matt. xxviii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14). It follows logically that the Pope is also infallible in judging doctrines and facts so intimately connected with revelation, that they cannot be denied without endangering revelation itself. Such, for example, are theological conclusions (Christ has a human body and a human soul), truths of philosophy (the notions of person, substance, the spirituality of the soul), dogmatic facts (St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; Pope Pius XI was validly elected), and disciplinary matters (the law ordering Communion under one species).

4. When he intends to bind the whole Church. "The in-

tention of binding all the faithful must be clearly stated" as Cardinal Hergenröther says (*Church and State*, i., 83) What he might think or intend to say, but did not actually express, is not an infallible utterance.

Once we admit that the Church is infallible, it follows naturally that its head and mouthpiece must likewise be infallible. For if Peter and his successors, could as supreme pastors teach false doctrine, they would cease to be the rock foundation on which the Church was built; the gates of hell would prevail contrary to Christ's promise; error would be sanctioned in heaven; the faith of the brethren would not be strengthened; the flock of Christ would not be fed with the true food of divine faith (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31, 32; John xvi. 16, 17).

The Fourth Council of Constantinople (869) taught that "in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has ever been preserved free from stain"; Pope Agatho's (678-681) letter, read and approved by the Third Council of Constantinople (680), declares "that Peter's Apostolic Church has never departed from the way of truth into any error whatsoever"; of Pope Leo's (440-461) letter to Flavian, the Bishops of Chalcedon (451), said: "Peter hath spoken thus by the mouth of Leo"; the Council of Ephesus (431) calls Pope Celestine (422-432) "the guardian of the faith," who teaches right doctrine, because he is the successor of "Blessed Peter the Apostle, the head of the whole faith, and the head of the Apostles".

83. Does infallibility mean the Pope can do no wrong?

Infallibility is not a personal, but a divine, official prerogative, given by Christ to Peter and his successors to keep them from error in defining the content of the Gospel.

84. If Peter were infallible, why did he deny Christ?

The infallible primacy was not given to St. Peter until after the Resurrection (John xvi. 16), and, moreover, infallibility has no reference to the personal errors or sins of individual Popes.

85. How could an immoral and worldly Pope like Alexander VI (1492-1508) be infallible?

Infallibility, freedom from error in declaring to the world the Gospel of Christ, and *impeccability*, freedom from sin, are two totally different things. While we naturally expect the Popes to be of the highest moral character,—and most of them have been,—the official prerogative of infallibility has nothing whatever to do with the Pope's personal goodness or wickedness.

Our Lord told the Jews that the personal unworthiness of the Scribes and Pharisees in no way nullified their true teaching. "All things whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not" (Matt. xxiii. 3). The notion that a temporal or an ecclesiastical superior loses his authority whilst he is in the state of mortal sin, was an error of Wyclif, condemned by the Church in the fourteenth century.

86. How could one infallible Pope condemn Joan of Arc to be burned as a witch, while another Pope declares her a saint?

Pope Eugenius IV knew nothing of the trial and condemnation of St. Joan of Arc by the scoundrel Bishop Cauchon of Beauvais, for a month before her death he ignores it in a letter to his legate in France, Cardinal de Sainte-Croix, asking him to bring about peace between the Kings of France and England. It is true that the Maid of Orleans appealed to the Pope during her trial, but her unjust judges, under English influence and in English pay, denied her appeal, knowing that Rome would recognize the invalidity of their mock trial.

The annulment of St. Joan's unjust sentence was declared solemnly at Rouen, July 7, 1456, a sentence confirmed in our days by Leo XIII, Pius X and Benedict XV, who in turn declared her venerable, blessed and a saint.

87. Were Popes Paul V (1605-1621) and Urban VIII (1623-1644) infallible when they condemned Galileo for holding a true scientific theory?

Catholics readily grant that Popes Paul V and Urban VIII, together with the Cardinals of the Index (1616), and the Inquisition (1632), who rendered their judgments in the Popes' names, were mistaken about the truth of the Copernican theory. A careful study, however, of the decrees they issued proves clearly that they were not infallible pronouncements. There is no question in either of them of any *ex cathedra* teaching, or of any intention to propose a doctrine to be held by the universal Church.

The decree of 1616 merely prohibits all books that teach the Copernican theory. It does not command the faithful to hold the Ptolemaic theory as true, and denounce the Copernican theory as false. It is, therefore, evidently a disciplinary decree prescribing WHAT ONE MUST DO, AND NOT WHAT ONE MUST BELIEVE. It is true that the reasons that prompted the Pope and the Cardinals to pass the decree were doctrinal, but

these reasons never form part of the decree itself. Even in an infallible decision they may be considered erroneous, as all theologians teach. Before 1854 the Popes had issued several disciplinary decrees concerning the Immaculate Conception, with the idea of impressing this dogma upon the minds of the faithful; but no one ever dreamed of considering these decrees infallible.

It is certain that neither in Galileo's time, nor in the period immediately following, can one theologian or scholar be found who considered the two decrees condemning Galileo infallible. On the contrary, many may be cited who plainly assert that they were not.

Cardinal Bellarmine wrote, April 12, 1615, to Father Foscarini: "I wish to say that if ever the Copernican theory be really demonstrated, we must then be more careful in explaining those passages of the Scriptures which appear contrary thereunto. We must then say that we do not understand their meaning, rather than declare a thing false which has been proved to be true. But I do not think that such a demonstration will ever be made."

In 1643, Gassendi, a friend of Galileo, wrote: "I do not consider their decision an article of faith. I do not believe that the Cardinals have so declared it, nor that their decrees have been promulgated and received by the whole Church" (*De Motu Impresso*, iii., 471).

The Jesuit, Riccioli wrote in 1651: "As in this matter there has been no definition by the Sovereign Pontiff, nor by a Council directed or approved by him, it is by no means of faith that the sun moves and that the earth is immovable, at least in virtue of the decree" (*Almagestum Novum*, i., 52).

We must not forget that the scientists of the day were just as bitter against Galileo as the theologians, for as a body they accepted without question the Ptolemaic theory, and were rightly convinced that Galileo had not adduced a single scientific proof for his novel thesis. The only three scientific arguments that he did bring forward, based as they were on the phenomena of the tides, the movement of the solar spots, and the apparent movement of the planets, either proved nothing at all in favour of the Copernican theory, or were in absolute contradiction to the facts. As the astronomer Laplace put it, Galileo defended his views only by proofs from analogy. Such proofs have undoubtedly a real value, but they do not afford any demonstrative proof. Galileo was ignorant of many facts that school children know to-day, viz., the phenomena of aberration, the depression of the earth at the poles, the variation of the pendulum according to latitude and the like.

It is now universally admitted that although Galileo was threatened with torture, he escaped it because of his age, and through the influence of his many Roman friends. The acts of the trial are utterly silent on this matter, nor did Galileo or his friends ever allude to it.

When Galileo came to Rome for his trial, he was not kept in the loathsome dungeons of the Inquisition, as some controversialists have falsely stated, but he resided first in the beautiful Villa Medici of his friend Niccolini, and afterwards, during the interrogatories, in the treasury apartments of the Inquisition, where three large rooms were placed at his disposal.

No scholar to-day admits the fable of Galileo's *E pur se muove*, which first saw the light in the unreliable *Querelles Littéraires* of the Abbé Iraitlh in 1761. The records of the trial present Galileo as most submissive throughout. The very day of his condemnation to the prison of the Inquisition, the Pope commuted this penalty, assigning as his prison the home of his friend Niccolini. After visiting another devoted friend, Cardinal Piccolomini of Siena, for five months, Galileo retired to his own villa of Arcetri, near Florence. He continued his studies undaunted, and was visited by scholars from all parts of the world. The Pope continued to grant him the pension of one hundred crowns, which he had given him since 1630, and on his death-bed in 1642 sent him the Apostolic Benediction.

The Galileo case was providential, because it taught churchmen the folly of too hasty a resort to ecclesiastical censures. The theologians of the day who urged the Holy See to condemn Galileo, were led by a high motive,—to defend, as they thought, a truth of divine revelation. They were right in holding that, as a general law, Scriptural texts are to be interpreted in their literal sense; they were wrong in forgetting the wise teaching of both St. Augustine and St. Thomas, that in describing the phenomena of nature, the Bible speaks according to appearances.

VII. PERSECUTION, INTOLERANCE

88. Does your Church approve of bringing people into her fold by force?

No, the Church is in no way responsible for the actions of Catholic sovereigns, who from motives of policy, avarice or mistaken zeal used force in bringing about conversions. Alcuin and Arno of Salsburg severely blamed Charlemagne for his enforced conversion of the pagan Saxons; Pope Innocent XI rebuked Louis XIV for his cruel dragonnades, and

asked James II to interpose his good offices on behalf of the oppressed French Huguenots; Sixtus IV continually denounced the arbitrary cruelty and injustice of the Spanish Inquisition (Alzog, *Church History*, ii., 122; iii., 284; Pastor *History of the Popes*, iv., 399-402).

The teaching of the Church on this matter is plainly set forth in the writings of Tertullian, Lactantius, and others. Tertullian writes: "It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his convictions. It is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion. It must be embraced freely and not forced" (*Ad Scapulam*, ii., ch. ii.). Lactantius writes: "There is no justification for violence and injury, for religion cannot be imposed by force. It is a matter of the will, which must be influenced by words, not by blows. . . . Religion is to be defended, not by putting to death, but by dying; not by cruelty, but by patient endurance; not by crime, but by faith. . . . If you wish to defend religion by bloodshed, by tortures and by crime, you no longer defend it, but pollute and profane it. For nothing is so much a matter of free will as religion" (*Divin. Instit.*, v., 20).

89. Are not Catholics bound to defend the Inquisition with all its cruelty and injustice as an essential part of the Church's constitution ?

"Catholics," writes Father Keating, "are by no means concerned to defend this tribunal in all the details of its activity. It manifested all the characteristics of administration of justice in those rude times, though generally in a milder form. That its processes, according to modern notions, were faulty; that, just like the secular courts of law, it often suffered from the abuses to which its procedure laid it open; that it was used to satisfy avarice and glut private enmities; that its officials were not always above suspicion in their motives; that its penalties were often arbitrary, unjust, cruel—these may be established facts; but the inference is not that the institution was unwarranted by the circumstances of the age or opposed to its mentality. The attachment of physical penalties to offences largely spiritual, the use of torture to elicit evidence, the defects of the legal methods, the harshness of the sentences, these characterized the tribunal, not because it was Catholic, but because it was medieval. . . . There is nothing in the history of the Inquisition which invalidates the claim of the Church to be the Church of Christ. All that Christ guaranteed her in her institution was that, through His divine power, she should never

cease to exist, should always be guided in her teaching by His Spirit, and should never, therefore, lead His flock astray into false pastures. For the rest the Church is composed of human beings, and, therefore, outside the limits implied in these divine promises, is exposed to human frailties. History shows that she has not been protected against mistakes in policy and errors in administration" (*Does the Catholic Church Persecute?*, 21, 22).

Blotzer writes in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*: "It is essential to note that the Inquisition, in its establishment and procedure, pertains not to the sphere of belief, but to that of discipline. The dogmatic teaching of the Church is in no way affected by the question whether the Inquisition was justified in its scope, wise in its methods, or extreme in its practice" (viii., 36).

A fairminded man ought not to view the twelfth or the thirteenth century from the standpoint of the twentieth. In the Middle Ages the people regarded heresy with the same horror that men to-day regard crimes against women. The mob at Soissons, Orleans, and Cologne in the eleventh century burned the heretic at the stake, just as the mob in Tennessee and Alabama burns the negro for rape in the twentieth.

The very fact that the Church could call upon the civil power to repress rebellion against her teaching, proves conclusively that the men of that day considered the Church's teaching necessary for the well-being of society. Many non-Catholics to-day find this viewpoint difficult to understand, for with them religion is a matter of human opinion. They believe that a man is free to choose his religious beliefs, as he chooses the style of his coat, or his political opinions. They have ceased to regard religious truth as something objective; they have ceased to believe in a divine revelation.

We must remember also that heresy in the Middle Ages was very often allied with some anti-social sect, which, like modern anarchism and Bolshevism, menaced the very existence of the State. The Cathari of the thirteenth century not only denied the authority of the Church, the supremacy of the Pope, and the divine institution of the Sacraments, but they rejected the oath of fealty, condemned marriage as immoral, and advocated suicide as the highest duty of "the perfect."

Non-Catholics, who believe that the Church would revive the Inquisition to-day if she had the power, forget that the majority of modern theologians, while admitting the Church has a coercive power in both the external and internal forum, limit it to merely moral restraint. So Vacandard (*The Inquisition*, 250), Vermeersch

(*Tolerance*, 74), Cardinal Soglia (*Instit. Juris Pub. Eccles.*, i., 170), and Keating (*Does the Church Persecute?*, 28.)

90. Must we not thank the Reformation for the fact that men to-day are no longer tortured, imprisoned and put to death for heresy?

By no means. The leading Reformers both in England and on the Continent taught without question the medieval doctrine of intolerance.

Harnack says of Luther: "It is an altogether one-sided view, one, indeed, which willfully disregards the facts, to hail in Luther the man of the new age, the hero of enlightenment and the creator of the modern spirit" (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengesch.*, iii., 810). Catholics and Zwinglians in Saxony who did not conform to the Lutheran doctrine were to be exiled, and the Anabaptists, even though they did not openly teach seditious doctrines, were to be put to death (Grisar, *Luther*, v., 592; vi., 252). Melancthon in a letter to Calvin in 1554 approved the burning of Servetus, saying: "I agree entirely with your sentence; I also declare that your authorities have acted wisely and justly in putting this blasphemous man to death" (Grisar, *ibid.*, iii., 358). Calvin burned Servetus for denying the Trinity and wrote a treatise to defend his action. Farel wrote to Calvin in 1533: "Some people do not wish us to prosecute heretics. But because the Pope condemns the faithful (the Huguenots) for the crime of heresy, it is absurd to conclude that we must not put heretics to death, in order to strengthen the faithful". Theodore of Beza wrote in 1554: "What crime can be greater or more heinous than heresy, which sets at naught the word of God and all ecclesiastical discipline? Christian magistrates, do your duty to God, who has put the sword into your hand for the honour of His Majesty; strike valiantly these monsters in the guise of men" (Vacandard, *The Inquisition*: 222-224).

The history of the penal laws of Great Britain and Ireland under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Elizabeth, James I, Charles I, Cromwell, Charles II and William III is a history of fines, imprisonment, banishment, torture and death for the practice of the Catholic faith.

Lecky, after stating that Catholicism was "an ancient church, resting avowedly on the principle of authority, and defending herself against aggression and innovation," adds: "But what shall we say of a church that was but a thing of yesterday, a church that had as yet no services to show, no

claims upon the gratitude of mankind, a church that was by profession a creature of private judgment, and was in reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which, nevertheless, suppressed by force a worship that multitudes deem necessary for their salvation, and by all her organs, and with all her energies, persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers?" (*History of Rationalism in Europe*, ii., 19).

Hallam bears similar testimony. He writes: "Persecution for religious heterodoxy in all its degrees was in the sixteenth century the principle as well as the practice of every church. It was held inconsistent with the sovereignty of the magistrate to permit any religion but his own, inconsistent with his duty to suffer any but the true... Persecution is the deadly original sin of the reformed churches, which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive" (*Literature of Europe*, ii., ch. ii.; *Constitutional History*, i., ch. ii.).

91. Did not Charles IX of France and his mother Catherine de Médicis, under orders from the Pope, slaughter one hundred thousand Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572?

The Popes had nothing to do with the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. Pius V did not plan the massacre with Catherine de Médicis, nor did he ever urge it upon the French court in any way; Gregory XIII never approved of the crime, but had a *Te Deum* sung in thanksgiving for the saving of the King and the royal family from death, according to advices sent him from the French court. The Pope's congratulations were on a par with the congratulations sent in modern times by one State to another, when informed that a King or a President has escaped an assassin's bullet or bomb.

The massacre was a dastardly political crime of Catherine de Médicis, planned the evening before to avert the possible consequences of her attempted assassination of Coligny on August 22.

Not a bishop of France was present at the meeting that planned the massacre; no bishop ever gave it his approval. The Cardinal of Lorraine, who is often pictured blessing the daggers of the murderers of Paris, was actually in Rome when the massacre occurred. As the latest Protestant historian of Catherine says: "Upon Catherine de Médicis the chief responsibility for the deed must always rest." And he adds: "No one who knows anything of her character through her letters, or who had carefully studied her tortuous State policy, could suspect for one

moment that there was in her anything resembling religious fanaticism" (Van Dyck, *Catherine de Médicis*, ii., 88).

How many were killed in France during the six weeks of the massacre will never be accurately known. An ancient account book of the Hotel de Ville of Paris, cited by the Abbé de Caveirac in his *Apology of Louis XIV* mentions the burial of 1,100 victims in the Cemetery of the Innocents, while the *Huguenot Martyrology*, published in 1581, could only obtain the names of 786.

That France lied to the Pope about the facts in the case, describing the massacre as the just punishment of conspirators, we know from the reports of the King's messenger, De Beauvilier, and from the letters of the French ambassador de Féral, the Cardinal de Bourbon, and the Papal nuncio. Brantôme, in his *Memoirs*, says that when the Pope learned the real facts, he shed bitter tears, and denounced the massacre "as unlawful and forbidden by God."

92. Did not the cruel and bigoted Catholic Queen, Mary Tudor (1553-1558), put thousands of Protestants to death at the stake, thus meriting the title of "Bloody Mary"?

The title of "Bloody" might just as well have been given to Henry VIII, Elizabeth or Cromwell, had Catholicism and not Protestantism dominated English literature for the past four centuries.

The portrait of Mary Tudor as a cruel and bigoted tyrant, first sketched by the lying Foxe in his *Book of Martyrs*, and slavishly copied by many an anti-Catholic English historian (Hume, *History of England*, iv., 404), has within the past fifty years been stigmatized as a caricature by Catholic and non-Catholic students of the Tudor period, viz., Gardiner, Innes, Pastor, Pollard, Stone, Zimmermann and others.

But while her personal life was chaste and pious, all admit that as a political ruler of a powerful kingdom she was utterly incompetent and inefficient. Her Spanish blood prompted her to lean upon the Emperor, Charles V, and to marry Philip II, his son, an unwise and foolish policy that angered her people, led to the war with France, and antagonized Pope Paul IV, who, towards the end of her reign, excommunicated Philip II. In her conscientious desire to restore the stolen church lands, she failed to realize how much the wealthy English nobles dreaded the possible consequences of a reconciliation with the Papacy, although Rome was far-sighted enough to point out her mistake. Her worst error was her failure to understand the England of her

day, which had become religiously indifferent owing to the anti-Catholic reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Her misguided zeal, "for the peace of the Church," as Father Thurston calls it (*C. E.*, ix., 767), made her compel Parliament—no Tudor Parliament was free—to re-enact the heresy laws of Richard II, Henry IV and Henry V (December, 1554), which in four years sent not thousands but two hundred Protestants to the stake.

Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer ought to have been executed for treason, for they had all shared in Northumberland's plot to dethrone Mary (Lingard, *History of England*, v., 359, 472-474). When against the advice of the lawyers of the crown, the dying boy King Edward VI, at Northumberland's urging, illegally set aside his father's will, and transferred the succession to Lady Jane Grey, Cranmer signed the document. Even so ultra a Protestant apologist as Deane (*Thomas Cranmer*, 214-217) characterizes Cranmer as "a coward, a perjurer and a traitor." Mary, who hated heresy more than she hated treason, had Cranmer executed as a heretic—a mistake that the cleverer Elizabeth would not have made. She and her master, Cecil, put priests to death for saying Mass, but to save their face they hypocritically called it "treason."

93. Does not your practice of excommunicating and anathematizing people imply condemning them to eternal perdition?

Neither excommunication nor anathemas imply the Church's condemning anyone to hell. That is the prerogative of God alone. Excommunication is a Church law, excluding a notorious sinner from the communion of the faithful (Canons 2257-2267). Its purpose is to warn the sinner of the danger he runs of incurring eternal ruin, unless he repent of his sin. The "delivering of the sinner to Satan," which we find in the Roman Pontifical, is based on the words of St. Paul, who delivered the incestuous sinner to Satan, "that his spirit might be saved in the Day of the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. v. 5; *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 20).

The Council of Trent declares: "Although the sword of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline . . . yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be wielded rashly and for slight causes, it is more despised than feared, and works more evil than good" (Sess. xxv., ch. iii., *De Ref.*).

When St. Paul said "let him be anathema" who preaches an heretical gospel (Gal. i. 8), he did not condemn the heretic to hell, but stigmatized the wilful teacher of false doctrines as

a rebel against the Gospel of Christ. The Church, in the anathemas which accompany the canons of her Councils, merely imitates the example of the Apostle.

94. Is not the Roman Index a clear proof of clerical intolerance ?

The Roman Index proves, not the Church's intolerance, but her zeal for the salvation of souls. As Christ's representative, she is bound to safeguard by every means in her power the faith and morals of her children. Experience has taught her that many make shipwreck of their faith, and give themselves over to uncleanness on account of their indiscriminate reading. The State protects the public health of its citizens by combating epidemics, sequestering men and women afflicted with contagious diseases like smallpox, and restricting the sale of narcotics and poisons. The Church is bound to protect her children from the deadening and poisoning influence of the perverted written word.

In the New Testament we read of the converts at Ephesus burning about twenty five thousand rupees worth of magical books with the approval of St. Paul (Acts xix. 19). The Council of Nice in 325 condemned Arius' book, *Thalia*, and ordered all books containing the Arian heresy to be burned (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, i., 9). Pope Leo the Great (440-461) condemned the writings of the Priscillianists in Spain, and said that no one who read these books could be considered a good Catholic.

Every well-ordered State exercises some sort of censorship over the press, and enacts stringent laws against the circulation of immoral books and periodicals. This right of censorship has sometimes been abused, as in Prussia by Bismarck in his *Kulturkampf*, and in his campaign against the Socialists. In twelve years he banned some sixteen thousand books and pamphlets, more than the Index condemned in the whole nineteenth century. During the World War the most extreme censorship was exercised with regard to the public press, men's private correspondence, and the books which the soldiers were permitted to read. The Church is always at war with heresy, superstition, immorality and irreligion.

We can readily understand how the man without faith or morals himself can regard all censorship as an intolerant restraint upon his liberty. But the true Catholic will obey the laws of the Index, for he realizes that the Church is opposed not to liberty, but license. She is intolerant only of error and of sin. The Saviour said : "The truth shall make you free. Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John viii. 32, 33, 34). The

prudent gardener uproots noxious weeds to save his growing plants ; the skilful surgeon cuts off the gangrened leg to save his patient's life.

It is true that the Church's leaders may make a mistake in placing a book upon the Index, but the one mistake made in the condemnation of Copernicus and Galileo is a clear testimony of the guidance of the Holy Ghost, even when the Church is giving a non-infallible decision.

**95. Why does the Catholic Church forbid cremation ?
I see nothing evil in it.**

The Church does not forbid cremation because it is intrinsically evil, but because it goes counter to the Jewish and Christian tradition, and was initiated by anti-Christians with the express purpose of destroying belief in the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. (Gen. xv. 15 ; xxiii. 19).

If cremation were adopted, many of the beautiful prayers and ceremonies of the Church would become altogether meaningless. Absolutely speaking, the Church could change her ritual in this respect, but it is not at all likely that she will. If, however, the State were to make cremation compulsory, canonists hold that the Church would readily adapt her prayers to the new method of disposing of the dead.

96. Why have your Popes bitterly denounced Freemasons, and forbidden Catholics to join their lodges ?

The Popes have condemned Freemasonry, because it is a religion of naturalism which ignores Jesus Christ, and has identified itself, especially in Latin countries, with deism and atheism ; because its oaths are immoral in principle ; because it has from the outset been the Catholic Church's most determined enemy.

Freemasonry was first condemned by Pope Clement XII in 1738, even though many prominent Catholics of the time belonged to the lodges, such as the Duke of Wharton, the Duke of Norfolk, the Chevalier Ramsay and others. To assert that Masonry goes back to King Hiram of Tyre, to King Solomon of Jerusalem, or to the Egyptian Pharaohs is legend, not history. It was originally a Jacobite political society which repudiated the Pretender, and founded the first Grand Lodge in London, 1717, under the patronage of the Prince of Wales. Its constitution and ritual were written by the Prince's Huguenot chaplain, aided by a Scotch Presbyterian minister. Its aim was mutual assistance, and the worship of "The Great

Architect of the Universe," in which Jews, Christians and Mohammedans could equally participate. Begotten, as many believe (Findel, Lange) of English deism, it was taken up by French rationalists in 1721, who proceeded to organize its membership on a purely naturalistic basis. The Scottish Rite added thirty to the original three degrees; they were introduced in England by Preston in 1772, and in America by Webb in 1773.

The condemnation by Pope Clement XII was confirmed by Popes Benedict XIV (1751), Pius VII (1821), Leo XII (1836), Pius IX (1869) and Leo XIII (1884). All agreed that Masonry was a society that undermined the Catholic faith, fostered religious indifferentism and even advocated atheism, while fostering a universal contempt for all ecclesiastical authority. As Leo XIII said in his Encyclical *Humanum Genus*: "Its aim is the utter overthrow of that whole religious and political order of the world which the Christian teaching has produced and the substitution of a new state of things in accordance with their ideas, of which the foundations and laws shall be drawn from pure naturalism."

The papal excommunication deprives the Catholic who joins the Masons of the Sacraments, of all share in the Church's public prayers, and finally of Christian burial. A good Catholic recognizes the Church's divine right to command under penalty of sin, because he believes that she is the divine teacher of Christ's revelation, and the divine guardian of morals. It is certainly unreasonable to suppose that the Catholic Church, the great advocate of charity down the centuries, and the great defender of the natural right of association, would condemn any society on account of its benevolence or good-fellowship.

97. Why are Catholics hostile to the public schools ?

Catholics are not hostile to the public schools; they are critical of them—a totally different position. They cannot on principle accept the present system of public education because it does not give Catholic children the moral and religious training which they consider essential. As citizens who pay their proportionate share of the State's school tax, they have a right to criticize a defective State system of education.

The State has a right to insist upon its citizens being educated, but it has no right to hamper private initiative, or to establish a State monopoly in education. Provided religious and private schools accept the educational requirements which the State demands of its own schools, the State would inter-

fere with the rights of parent and the rights of conscience were it to compel attendance upon its own public schools.

The principles which govern Catholics in the matter of education are well set forth in the *Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the United States*, published in 1919. It says: "The right of the child to receive education and the correlative duty of providing it are established on the fact that man has a soul created by God, and endowed with capacities which need to be developed, for the good of the individual and the good of society. . . . Neither self-realization alone nor social service alone is the end of education, but rather these two in accordance with God's design, which gives to each of them its proportionate value. . . . Since the child is endowed with physical, intellectual and moral capacities, all these must be developed harmoniously. An education which quickens the intelligence and enriches the mind with knowledge, but fails to develop the will and direct it to the practice of virtue, may produce scholars, but it cannot produce good men . . . Since the duties we owe our Creator take precedence of all other duties, moral training must accord the first place to religion, that is, to the knowledge of God and His law, and must cultivate a spirit of obedience to His commands. . . . Moral and religious training is most efficacious when it is joined with instruction in other kinds of knowledge. It should so permeate these that its influence will be felt in every circumstance of life. . . . An education that unites intellectual, moral and religious elements is the best training for citizenship. It inculcates a sense of responsibility, a respect for authority and a considerateness for the rights of others, which are the necessary foundation of civic virtue."

98. Does not your teaching "Outside the Church there is no salvation" imply that all non-Catholics go to hell ?

It implies nothing of the kind. We believe that the Catholic Church is the one society for man's salvation instituted by Christ, and that, therefore, man must be affiliated with her in some way to be saved. That is what St. Cyprian meant when he said: "No one can have God for his Father, who has not the Church for his mother" (*On the Unity of the Church*, 6). But many souls, apparently outside the Church, are really within her fold in the sight of God. While not united with her *in fact*, they are in communion with her *in desire*.

The Church has always taught that no one is lost except through his own fault; that no one is held responsible by God for a duty that he cannot fulfill because of his invincible

ignorance. How could God condemn a man for not entering a Church of whose very existence he is ignorant? Pope Pius IX states the Catholic doctrine clearly: "Far be it from us to dare set bounds to the boundless mercy of God; far be it from us to desire to search into the depths of the hidden counsels and judgments of God, an abyss that the mind of man cannot explore. . . . We must hold as of faith, that out of the Apostolic Roman Church there is no salvation; that she is the only ark of safety, and whosoever is not in her perishes in the deluge; we must also, on the other hand, recognize with certainty that those who are in invincible ignorance of the true religion are not guilty for this in the eyes of the Lord. And who will presume to mark out the limits of this ignorance according to the character and diversity of peoples, countries, minds and the rest" (*Allocution*, December 9, 1854).

In his Encyclical to the Italian Bishops, August 10, 1863, he writes: "It is known to us and to you that those who are in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, but who observe carefully the natural law, and the precepts graven by God upon the hearts of all men, and who being disposed to obey God lead an honest and upright life, may, aided by the light of divine grace, attain to eternal life; for God who sees clearly, searches and knows the heart, the disposition, the thoughts and intentions of each, in His supreme mercy and goodness by no means permits that anyone suffer eternal punishment, who has not of his own free will fallen into sin."

Intelligent non-Catholics have often recognized the boundless charity of the Catholic Church, which condemns only those who freely and deliberately sin against the light. Mallock writes: "Never was there a religious body, except the Roman, that laid the intense stress she does on all her dogmatic teachings, and had yet the justice that comes of sympathy for those who cannot receive them. . . . The holy and humble of heart who do not know her, or who in good faith reject her, she commits with confidence to God's uncoveted mercies; and these she knows are infinite. . . . Her anathemas are on none but those who reject her with their eyes open, by tampering with a conviction that she is really the truth. These are condemned, not for seeing that the teacher is true, but because, having really seen this, they continue to close their eyes to it" (*Is Life Worth Living?*, ch. xi, 284-285).

99. Does your Church teach that all pagans are damned?

The Catholic Church does not teach that all pagans are

damned. Luther indeed damned the pagan philosophers, "even though they had been virtuous in their inmost soul." He held that even their good works were sins, because they had no faith in Christ, and their virtues were tainted by Original Sin (Grisar, *Luther*, i., 101 ; iii., 213).

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, teaches that "God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4) ; that God gives sufficient grace to all men to be saved ; that unbelief is never sinful unless it is voluntary.

The Council of Trent teaches "that no one can be brought from original sin into the grace of God, unless by Baptism *or the desire for it*." The pagan may never have heard of Baptism, and therefore the Gospel has not been promulgated as far as he is concerned. He must needs be saved by "the desire of Baptism." St. Thomas clearly teaches that a pagan "obtains the remission of his original sin through grace, once he has turned (has ordered himself) to God his Last End" (IIa IIæ. Q. 89, a. 6).

The pagan must have faith as a necessary means of salvation, for "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6). The Apostle immediately adds that he must accept two fundamental articles of faith, *viz.*, the existence of God, and His rewarding Providence. "For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and is a Rewarder to them that seek Him."

This divine gift of faith will be given to every well disposed soul, who is invincibly ignorant of the Gospel. Pope Clement XI condemned as heretical the teaching of Quesnel, who said that "no grace is given outside the Church." On the contrary, just as all fell in Adam, so all were elevated to the supernatural order through Christ, as St. Paul teaches (Rom. v. 18 ; Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22) This implies that the saving grace of Christ's Redemption is given to all men, illuminating their minds, and moving their wills, so that they turn to God as the True End of their being. If they are responsive to the divine inspiration they receive sanctifying grace which remits their Original Sin, and if they offend grievously afterwards, the grace of perfect contrition.

The pagan, however, is not saved by his good faith, but by divine faith ; *i. e.*, he must accept the revealed truths of God, explicitly with regard to God's existence and His rewarding Providence, implicitly with regard to all other dogmas. Believing in a supernatural Providence, the pagan by the very fact believes implicitly in Jesus Christ the One Mediator, because he has accepted all the means of salvation that God has provided,

the chief being Christ's Death on the Cross for the salvation of the world. Faith in the present order of divine Providence means a *faith of Christ* and a *faith in Christ*, because this virtue together with hope and charity is given mankind, only in view of the infinite merits of our Saviour.

This question is treated from the standpoint of both history and theology in the two scholarly volumes of the Abbé Caperan, *Le Problème du Salut des Infidèles*.

100. Is it not inconsistent for you to invite Protestants to attend doctrinal lectures in your Church, and yet at the same time to forbid Catholics to attend lectures in our churches, or take part in our services?

There is no inconsistency in our attitude. A Catholic would violate Catholic principles by attending services in a Protestant church, whereas a Protestant violates no principle of his religion by attending doctrinal lectures on Catholicism.

Protestantism is essentially a religion based on private judgment; a Protestant is logically a seeker after truth. In view of the many doctrinal divisions among the sects, and the many different viewpoints of liberal thought, the logical thinker in the outside churches can never be certain of his position. He must at least admit that the Catholic Church may be the one Church of Christ.

Catholicism is essentially a religion based on a divine, infallible teaching; a Catholic is logically a possessor of the truth. Why, therefore, should he seek for that which he already possesses? His faith precludes all possibility of doubt; it rests on the authority of God. He can never admit that other churches, liberal or orthodox, may possibly be right.

A Congregationalist minister once said to the writer: "What is better than searching for the truth?" "Finding it" was my answer.

VIII. ORIGINAL SIN, JUSTIFICATION.

101. Must Catholics accept the story of the apple and the serpent in Genesis literally?

The Catholic Church teaches that our first parents, Adam and Eve, were endowed by God with sanctifying grace, and with certain preternatural gifts, such as freedom from concupiscence, freedom from pain and death, and a high degree of knowledge. These gifts were dependent on their obedience to a moral com-

mand, proportionate to their knowledge of God and His will. We read in Genesis that God commanded Adam not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, threatening him with death if he disobeyed (Gen. ii. 17); and that Adam deliberately did disobey this express command (Gen. ii. 1-6). The tempter was the devil in the form of a serpent, as we learn from St. Paul and St. John (2 Cor. xii. 3; Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 2). Adam's sin was a sin of pride (Gen. ii. 22), and consisted in a formal disobedience to God and the law of probation (Rom. v. 19). The eating of an apple was a trivial thing in itself, but God made it a supreme test of loyalty. It was a grievous sin, because Adam could easily have avoided it, as there was in him neither ignorance nor concupiscence, and he certainly knew, as head of the race, what terrible consequences would follow for all mankind.

The Biblical Commission, June 30, 1900, declared that Catholics may not call into doubt the literal meaning of Genesis with regard to "the original happiness of our first parents, the command given by God to test their obedience, their disobedience of this command at the instigation of the devil, and the loss of their primitive state of innocence." If these facts are admitted, there is no strict obligation imposed of accepting all the minute details of their setting.

The consequences of Adam's sin are thus stated by the Council of Trent: "The first man Adam, having transgressed the mandate of God in Paradise, at once lost the sanctity and justice in which he had been constituted; incurred, through the offence of his prevarication, the anger and indignation of God, and, therefore, the death with which God had previously threatened him, and together with death, captivity under the power of him who thenceforth had the empire of death, that is, of the devil; Adam, through the offence of that prevarication, underwent a complete change for the worse in body and soul" (Sess. v., can. 8).

The human race is a unit summed up in its head Adam, and, therefore, the Church has ever taught that Adam's sin with all its effects was transmitted to all mankind. This was taught explicitly by the Council of Carthage in 418, the Council of Orange in 529, and the Council of Trent in 1546 (Sess. v., can. 1-4). "If any one assert that the prevarication of Adam was hurtful to himself only, and not to his progeny; and that he lost for himself only, and not for us, the sanctity and justice received from God; or that being himself defiled by the sin of disobedience, he transmitted to all mankind only death and the sufferings of the body, but not the sin which is the death of the

soul, let him be anathema, for he contradicts the Apostle, who says: 'Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world and by sin death, etc.' " (Rom. v. 12-18).

The dogma of Original Sin is clearly taught by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (v. 12-21). Not content with declaring that death comes from Adam (1. Cor. xv. 21, 22), he here asserts, while comparing the transgression of Adam with the grace of Christ's Redemption, that Adam's sin was transmitted to all mankind. "As by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of One, unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of One, many shall be made just" (Rom. v. 88, 19).

Original Sin is indeed a great mystery, which the human reason cannot fathom, but it does not imply any injustice on the part of God. Original Sin did not injure man in anything that was natural to him. All the supernatural and preternatural gifts that Adam lost for himself and for us were not his or ours by right, but were given Adam gratuitously by God, on the one condition that Adam was to obey His easy commandment. "Original Sin is not an evil bias, a tendency to wrong, a taint in spirit or in flesh, a corruption of any part of human nature as such. Concupiscence, the natural activity of instincts or passions not subordinate to reason, is not Original Sin, but a consequence of it, even though it may lead, often enough, to actual sin" (Martindale, *The Faith of the Roman Church*, 84). There would have been injustice only if God had imputed to us another's personal sin, or had deprived us of something due to human nature, as Luther taught. As Faà de Bruno says: "It is not the sin of Adam inasmuch as that was personal which God imputes, but the necessary effect of that sin, i.e., the deprivation and the rejection, as it were, of original justice, which Adam wilfully incurred as the head of the whole human race, and which, therefore, we also, as united to Adam have incurred. In this no vestige of injustice appears" (*Catholic Belief*, 349).

102. Is human nature capable of reasoning about God, or of performing good deeds of itself? Was Calvin right in holding that *all* the acts of sinners are sins? Can man of himself work out his own salvation?

The Catholic Church condemns equally the heresy of Pelagius, who taught that human nature of itself could perform all acts necessary to salvation, and the heresy of Calvin

who held that *all* the acts of sinners were sins (*Council of Trent*, Sess. vi., canons 1-7). She has ever defended the rights of reason and human nature against the Reformers of the sixteenth century and the rights of faith and supernature against ancient paganism and modern rationalism.

The Catholic Church teaches that a knowledge of God and the moral law is within the reach of our natural powers (*Vatican Council*, Sess. iii., *De Rev.*, can. 1; *Cf.* *Wisd.* iii. 5; *Rom.* i. 20, ii. 14). The power of willing and of performing good works is instinctive to man. St. Paul says: "When the Gentiles who have not the law, do by nature the things that are of the law; these, having not the law, are a law to themselves... their conscience bearing witness to them" (*Rom.* ii. 14). God rewards the good deeds of the pagans (*Exod.* i. 21; *Ezech.* xxix. 18), and our Lord recognizes the natural love and friendship of the pagans as something good (*Matt.* v. 47).

The grace of God, a supernatural gift bestowed upon us through the merits of Christ's Passion and Death, is absolutely necessary for us to attain eternal life. Grace is necessary for the beginning of faith; it is necessary for the just man to persevere in the grace he has already received; it is necessary for him to avoid all venial sins. St. Paul teaches the necessity of grace for salutary thoughts, resolves and actions. All right *thinking* is from God: "Not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God" (*2 Cor.* iii. 5). The righteous *will* must rest on the divine mercy: "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (*Rom.* ix. 16). The righteous *action* is from beginning to end from God: "It is God who worketh in you both to will and to accomplish" (*Phil.* ii. 13). He ascribes all his virtue, and all the wonderful results of his missions to the grace of God: "By the grace of God I am what I am; and His grace in me hath not been void, but I have laboured more abundantly than all they; yet not I, but the grace of God with me" (*1 Cor.* xv. 10).

The Apostle is merely repeating the teaching of Christ, who said: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in Me. . . . Without Me you can do nothing" (*John* xv. 4, 5).

Actual grace is required that we may be strengthened in the hour of conflict (*Rom.* vii. 19), but sanctifying grace is also needed to preserve us from sin. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath delivered me from the law of

sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). Sanctifying grace is a permanent quality of the soul, whereby we share the divine life (John xiv. 6; xv. 5), become partakers of the Divine Nature (2 Peter i. 4), receive the adoption of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5; 1 John i. 3; 1 Peter i. 23; James i. 13), and are made temples of the Holy Spirit (Rom. v. 1; viii. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19).

103. Does not St. Paul teach that a man is justified by faith? "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. iii. 28).

It is perfectly true that we are justified by faith, but not by faith "alone", as Luther impudently perverted this text (Rom. iii. 28). We are justified by a faith that worketh by charity (Gal. v. 6).

Luther's teaching that faith alone justifies (*Augsburg Confession*, iv., *De Just.*, 26) was condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., can. 12), because it clearly contradicted the Sacred Scriptures. "Faith without works is dead," says St. James (ii. 16). Faith with Luther meant a man's confidence that his sins had been forgiven by God for Christ's sake, whereas Christ and His Apostles always taught that faith implied the acceptance of all God's revelation on His word (Mark i. 15; xvi. 16; Luke xviii. 8; xxiv. 25-28; John xi. 25-27; Rom. iii. 22-25; ix. 30-33; Eph. iii. 8-12; Heb. xi. 6). Without faith justification is impossible; it is "the root of all justification, the beginning and the foundation of man's salvation." Other dispositions are required, for faith necessarily leads to action. We must not only believe, but we must hope, repent and love (Trent, Sess. vi., ch. vi.; *Cf.* can. 9). "We are saved by hope" (Rom. viii. 24). "Do penance and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins" (Acts ii. 38). "If I have all faith so as to move mountains and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. xiii. 2).

104. Does not the Catholic doctrine of merit dishonour the Redemption of Christ, by ascribing salvation to one's personal efforts?

Merit is the value attached by God to our good deeds, which we freely perform by the help of divine grace. The Church has always taught that the doctrine of merit rested, not, as Luther falsely asserted, on any absolute right to reward in the works themselves, but on the express promise of God to reward faithful service to Him by grace here and glory hereafter.

It is indeed absurd to speak of God as our debtor, for our deeds can bring Him no advantage. We owe all we have and are to God. But the Scriptures plainly teach that if our good works are freely done in His honour and service, aided always by His divine grace, they are indeed meritorious according to His divine plan. All our merit is primarily His, for He won our right to grace and glory by His infinite merits, when He redeemed us by His Passion and Death.

Eternal life is our inheritance as adopted sons of God, but it is also our reward. "Knowing that you shall receive the reward of inheritance" (Col. iii. 24). Eternal life is a free grace, but that merely proves that grace is necessary to merit it. As St. Augustine says: "When God crowns our merits, He crowns His own gifts" (*Epis.*, 194, 19).

The Council of Trent thus states the Catholic doctrine: "Eternal life is to be proposed to those who do good unto the end and hope in God, both AS A GRACE mercifully promised to the children of God through Jesus Christ, and AS A REWARD to be faithfully rendered to their good works and merits, in virtue of the promise of God Himself (2 Tim. iv. 7). . . . For since Christ Jesus Himself constantly communicated His virtue to those who are justified, as the Head to the members (Eph. iv. 15), and as the Vine to the branches (John xv. 5), which virtue always preceded, accompanied and followed their good works, and without which they could be nowise agreeable to God and meritorious; we must believe that nothing more is wanting to the justified nor is there any reason why they should not be considered as having fully satisfied the divine law, as far as the condition of this life admits, by such works as are done in God, and truly merited the attainment of eternal life in due time, if they die in the state of grace" (Sess. vi., ch. xvi.).

The doctrine of merit is expressly taught in many passages of the New Testament. "I was hungry and you gave Me to eat" (Matt. xxv. 42). "Sell what you possess and give alms; make to yourself bags which grow not old, a treasure in heaven which faileth not" (Luke xii. 33; Cf. xiv. 9-13). "Who will render to every man according to his works" (Rom. ii. 6). "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labours" (1 Cor. iii. 8). "Know you not that they that run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain" (1 Cor. xii. 24). "For that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulations worketh for us above measure an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. iv. 17). "Godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now

is, and of that which is to come" (1 Tim. iv. 8). "Therefore let us consider one another to provoke to charity and good works. For patience is necessary for you, that doing the will of God, you may receive the promise; for He is faithful that hath promised" (Heb. x. 23, 24, 36). "Labour the more that by good works you may make sure your calling and election" (2 Peter i. 10). "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life" (Apoc. ii. 10). "My reward is with Me to render to every man according to his works" (Apoc. xxii. 12)

IX. SACRAMENTS

105. Are not the Sacraments hindrances to real religion, making it dependent upon a meaningless ritual?

The very definition of a Sacrament proves that it is not a meaningless ritual, for a Sacrament is a visible sign instituted by Christ, signifying and producing sanctifying grace in the soul. Three elements constitute a Sacrament: 1. The visible sign; *v. g.*, the external washing of water (by pouring, sprinkling or immersion) in Baptism with the invocation of the Blessed Trinity aptly signifies the internal cleansing of the soul from original and actual sin. 2. The producing of interior grace; *v. g.*, Baptism produces sanctifying grace in the soul, so that "by water and the Holy Ghost," as our Lord taught, we are supernaturally born into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5; *Cf.* Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16). 3. The institution of Christ; *v. g.*, the Apostolic commission includes the command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 16).

God's grace, although it ordinarily comes to us by Christ's institution through the Mass and seven Sacraments, is not denied to a non-Catholic who does not know of their existence, or to a Catholic who cannot receive them because no priest is available at the hour of death. God gives sufficient grace to everyone to be saved, as St. Paul teaches: "He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 4). Many a High Church Episcopalian convert has asked me whether the graces he felt he had received in past communions were a mere mockery. "Not in the least," I answered, "for you have been making spiritual communions in good faith, even though you did not realize that your minister was a mere layman going through an empty form."

It is of faith that Christ instituted the seven Sacraments (Trent, Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. 1), but it is also clear from the history of both East and West that He did not determine, save

in a most general way, the matter and form of certain Sacraments such as Confirmation, Orders and Extreme Unction. He allowed the Church to determine them with precision. The Sacraments of the Eastern Orthodox Church are perfectly valid, although they use a different form of Confirmation, employ a deprecatory form of absolution in the Sacrament of Penance and confer Orders by laying on the right hand only.

The Sacraments, instead of being hindrances to religion, are on the contrary the greatest possible divine helps to sanctify our souls, for they apply the infinite merits of Christ's Redemption to us. When we are dead in sin they give us the divine life in the Sacraments of the Dead (Baptism and Penance), and when we are in the state of grace, they give us the divine life more abundantly (John x. 10) in the Sacraments of the Living (Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony and the Holy Eucharist).

The Sacrament of Penance has reconciled millions of sinners to God, strengthening their faith, enlivening their hope, and intensifying their love of Christ Jesus. The unbelieving Harnack rightly accuses Protestantism of "culpable folly" in depriving souls of its power for good (*Reden und Aufsätze*, ii., 256). Holy Communion unites the soul with Christ in a most intimate bond, and Jesus really and truly present in us (John vi. 57) is the origin and incentive of every virtue.

Christianity is a sacramental religion. Christ is God and Man. His Church is visible and invisible, with a divine and a human element. We, the members of the Church, are not disembodied spirits, but creatures of body and soul. We therefore naturally expect the life of the Church to be a supernatural life so given by Christ, as to make visible human things at once the signs and the causes of things invisible and divine. The ritual of the Sacraments cannot be meaningless, for they all signify the grace of God, and effect it in our souls.

106. Do not Catholics attribute a magical effect to the Sacraments?

Not at all. The Catholic Church condemns magic as a mortal sin against the virtue of religion, and brands it as an immoral attempt to work miracles by the power of the devil. We call an action magical, when an inadequate and insufficient cause is expected to produce a higher effect; when what is material or created is regarded as the cause of something spiritual or divine.

The efficacy of the Sacraments does not depend upon the one

who administers them, nor upon humanly devised formulas, which compel God to act in a certain way; they depend solely upon Jesus Christ who instituted them for our salvation.

107. How can you prove that there are seven Sacraments ?

The Reformers, while differing among themselves with regard to the number of the Sacraments, all agreed in rejecting the number seven. Luther, who first accepted three, Baptism, Penance and the Lord's Supper (Grisar, *Luther*, ii., 27), finally agreed with Calvin in reducing the number to two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Against them the Council of Trent taught that "there are neither more nor less than seven Sacraments" (Sess. vii., can. 1).

The New Testament mentions all the Sacraments more or less explicitly, as we shall see in the following pages, but never gives us a list of them. There is nowhere in its pages a systematic statement of the teachings of Christ, as one might find in a creed, a catechism, or a manual of theology. Christ entrusted to His Church all His seven Sacraments just as He entrusted the Bible to her safe keeping, but while she used daily these means of grace and salvation, she did not at once make an inventory of them.

The early Fathers mentioned, indeed, all of the seven Sacraments, but they never drew up a complete list of them. Most of their references were made with the practical aim of instructing catechumens and the faithful, or of refuting the current heresies. As a rule, they did not write systematic treatises of theology, nor had they come to any agreement regarding the precise meaning of a Sacrament. They had no criterion to distinguish the rites of the Church, which are productive signs of grace (Sacraments), from those which are simply signs (sacramentals).

We however find the Apostolic Fathers, like St. Justin, mentioning frequently Baptism and the Eucharist, to refute the calumnies of the pagans. Tertullian a hundred years later speaks also of Confirmation and Penance. In the third century the baptismal controversy made writers of both East and West discuss the conditions necessary for the validity of Baptism, Confirmation, Orders and the Eucharist. Fourth century writers like St. Cyril wrote treatises on Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist for the instruction of the catechumens. The Donatist controversy led St. Augustine to treat of Baptism and Orders, while the Pelagian heresy compelled him to prove that

the sanctity of Marriage could be reconciled with the propagation of Original Sin. He mentions six of the seven Sacraments, and the seventh, Extreme Unction, is described by his contemporary, Pope Innocent I (401-417), in his letter to Decentius of Gubbio. By the fifth century, therefore, we meet with all the seven Sacraments, not only among the Catholic Fathers, but also in the writings of the Nestorians and Monophysites, who still accept them all.

108. May a non-Catholic or a sinner validly baptize?

Non-Catholics and sinners may validly baptize, for the validity of the Sacrament does not depend upon the personal worthiness or the orthodoxy of the minister (Trent, Sess. vii. can. 12; *De Bapt.*, can. 4). This has been the constant tradition of the Church, as we may learn from the condemnation of St. Cyprian's views by Pope St. Stephen (254-257), and of the Donatists by the Council of Arles in 314.

109. As a Baptist I hold that immersion is the only true baptism.

The Catholic Church teaches that Baptism consists in the washing of water with the invocation of the Blessed Trinity (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Bapt.*, can. 2; *Decretum pro Armenis*).

The Greek word "Baptizein" is used by profane authors to mean the dipping of an object into water, or the washing it by either aspersion or immersion (Kitto, *Bibl. Encycl.*, "Baptism"). In the Scriptures it means bathing or washing (4 Kings v. 14; Judith xii. 7; Eccles. xxxiv. 30; Mark vii. 3, 4; Luke xi. 38), being overwhelmed with evils (Isa. xxi. 4; Mark x. 33; Luke xii. 50), or the Sacrament of Baptism by which men are spiritually cleansed (John iii. 5; Matt. xxviii. 19; Rom. vi. 3).

No argument can be drawn from our Lord's baptism by John (Matt. iii. 16), for the sinless Son of God needed no cleansing from sin. John's baptism, although superior to the legal purifications of the Jews (Exod. xxx. 17-21; Lev. vi. 27; Num. xix. 7), was essentially distinct and inferior to the Baptism instituted by Christ (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Bapt.*, can. 1). It was at best an external ceremony of bodily ablution (John i. 31), which, according to John himself, did not confer grace or impart the Holy Spirit (John i. 31; Cf. Mark i. 8). As St. Thomas says: "It prepared men for grace, leading men to faith in Christ, and exciting them to sorrow for their sins" (*Summa Theol.*, III., Q. 38, art. 3). That is why St. Paul

rebaptized those who had received the baptism of John. They had not received the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 2-5).

Catholics admit that immersion brings out more fully the meaning of the Sacrament (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 27), and that for twelve centuries it was the common practice. St. Thomas tells us it was the common practice in the thirteenth century, but he adds: "Baptism can also be conferred by sprinkling and pouring" (*Summa Theol.*, III., Q. 66, art. 7).

Divine tradition clearly proves that from the beginning Baptism by sprinkling or pouring was always considered as valid as Baptism by immersion. Tertullian describes Baptism as "a sprinkling with any kind of water" (*De Bapt.*, ch. 6). St. Augustine says that Baptism forgives sins even if the water "merely sprinkles the child ever so slightly" (*In Joan.*, lxxx., 3). The Baptism of invalids, clinical Baptism (from *Kline*, a bed), was given by the pouring of water (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 43), and a document of the first century, the *Document of the Twelve Apostles*, prescribes effusion when there is not enough water available for immersion (ch. viii.).

The proof from archaeology of Baptism by effusion is most convincing. Duchesne writes: We constantly see representations of the celebration of Baptism on monuments. . . . But do we ever see total immersion? Such a thing is NEVER seen. This immersion is never to be met with in the mosaics of ancient churches, in the paintings of the Catacombs, in ordinary pictures, domestic objects, glasses, spoons, etc.; it is never sculptured or engraved on marble. In all such ancient monuments the neophyte appears standing, his feet in the water, but the greater part of the body out of the water, while water is poured on his head with the hand or with a vase. This is Baptism by infusion, not by immersion (*Churches Separated from Rome*, 62).

Threefold washing by immersion, effusion or sprinkling has always been the common custom, but it is not essential (Pope Gregory the Great, *Epis.* 43). It is required to-day by the Church, although a single washing would certainly be valid.

It is certainly not probable that the three thousand converts of St. Peter on Pentecost (Acts ii. 41) were baptized by immersion, owing to their great numbers, and to the scarcity of water in Jerusalem (Robertson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 479-516). Immersion again was not practical in the home of Cornelius (Acts x. 47, 48), or in the prison at Philippi (Acts xvi. 33).

The very fact that Baptism is necessary for salvation proves that immersion is not the only method allowed by Jesus Christ. Are men in prison, the sick and dying, children just born, the Esquimaux of the Arctic Circle or the Bedouins of the desert, to die without Baptism, because immersion is practically impossible?

110. Does your Church teach that Baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation?

It is of faith that Baptism is a necessary means of salvation (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., can. 5). The words of Christ are plain: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John ii. 5). He commanded the Apostles to baptize all nations, and promised salvation to all who believed and were baptized (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16).

The Catholic Church does not condemn everyone to hell who has not been baptized with water. She mitigates the apparent harshness of her doctrine by teaching that in case of urgent necessity the Baptism of desire will suffice (Council of Trent. vi., *De Just.*, cap. iv.; Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. 4). This is the doctrine of the Fathers of the Church.

The Baptism of blood, or martyrdom for Christ, was also regarded by the Fathers as an equivalent for Baptism of water. (*De Civ. Dei.*, xiii., 2).

Adults who die without the knowledge of the Gospel are saved by the merits of Christ, if they die in perfect charity or are perfectly contrite for their sins. This includes the implicit desire of Baptism, which is defined as "a state of mind in which a man would ardently long for Baptism, if he knew that it was necessary for salvation."

Children dying unbaptized are indeed deprived of the Beatific Vision of God in heaven, but they do not incur the punishment of hell, which is due only to actual sin. Their deprivation of heaven is not unjust on God's part, for the glory of heaven is a free, supernatural gift, in no way due to human nature. It is highly probable that they enjoy a natural happiness, as St. Thomas teaches (in IV Sent. II, dist. xxx, Q. 2, ad. 5).

111. Did the early Church believe in infant Baptism?

There is no express mention of the baptizing of infants in the New Testament, but it is at least probable that there were infants among the whole families that were baptized by St. Paul (Acts xvi. 15; 1 Cor. i. 16). The necessity of infant Baptism follows

from the fact that they have contracted the guilt of original sin (Rom. xii. 5-19), which Baptism alone can remit (John iii. 5).

The early Fathers are unanimous in insisting upon infant Baptism, basing it on the universal command of Christ to all (Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 5), and on its divine power to cleanse from original sin.

The Council of Milevis (416) taught the necessity of infant Baptism, and this doctrine was repeated in the Councils of Fourth Lateran, Vienne, Florence and Trent.

112. Are parents bound to give Christian names to their children at Baptism?

They are, according to canon law (Canon 761). When they refuse to do so, the pastor is bound to add a saint's name to the name proposed by the parents, and to record both names in the baptismal register.

113. Why do you rebaptize Protestants when they enter your Church?

We do not rebaptize them, as Baptism can be received only once. We baptize converts conditionally, only when a prudent doubt exists about the validity of the former Baptism. The form is: "If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee," etc. If the first Baptism was valid, the conditional Baptism is not a Sacrament.

114. Can you prove from the Bible that Confirmation is a Sacrament distinct from Baptism?

The institution of Confirmation by Christ is nowhere expressly stated in the New Testament, but Catholics are certain that it is a divinely instituted Sacrament distinct from Baptism by the infallible witness of the Church (Council of Trent, Sess. vii., *De Sac.*, can. I; *De Conf.*, can. 1).

Christ promised that those who believed in Him would receive the Holy Ghost (John vii. 37-39; John xiv. 16; xv. 26; xvi. 7). The Apostles "were filled with the Holy Ghost" on Pentecost (Acts ii. 4), and both St. John (vii. 38) and St. Peter (Acts ii. 38) declare that this Pentecostal gift was intended for all Christians. The Apostles imparted the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, a sacramental rite distinct from Baptism, for the Samaritans whom Peter and John confirmed had already been baptized by Philip (Acts viii. 14, 18). St. Paul and St. John make frequent references to Confirmation (2. Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13; Tit. iii. 5; 1 John ii. 20, 27). The Apostles would certainly

not have confirmed the faithful by a distinct rite after Baptism, unless they had received it from Christ.

St. Jerome speaks of Confirmation being given by the Bishops of his time (*Dial. adv. Lucif.*, 9), and he cites the passage on Confirmation in the Acts of the Apostles, as St. Cyprian had done two hundred years before (*Epis.* 73, *Ad Jubain*, 9; Cf. Tertullian, *De Bapt.*, 7).

That the laying on of hands did not mean simply the bestowing of extraordinary gifts, is proved by the fact that these gifts were sometimes given without any external rite (Acts x. 44), and did not always accompany Confirmation (I Cor. xii. 30).

115. Why do Catholics believe that they receive the living Christ in Communion ?

Catholics believe in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist, because He promised to give His Flesh as food and His Blood as drink (John vi. 48-70); because He fulfilled this promise at the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25); because St. Paul declares this was the belief of the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 27-29); because the early Fathers explicitly taught that the Eucharist was "the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus" (St. Justin, *Apol.*, i., 66); because Christ's infallible Church solemnly defined this doctrine against the Reformers of the sixteenth century. "The Holy Synod teaches . . . that in the august Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and Man, is truly, really and substantially contained under the appearance of those sensible things . . . If anyone denies that in the Sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but says that He is therein only as a sign, or a figure or virtually, let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., ch. 1, can. 1).

116. Ought not the sixth chapter of St. John to be interpreted figuratively ? Does not the phrase "to eat flesh" signify belief in the divinity of Christ ?

Catholics make a distinction between the first part of John vi. (vv. 26 to 51), wherein Christ speaks of Himself figuratively as the Bread of Heaven, a spiritual food to be received by faith, and the second part (vv. 51 to 59), wherein He speaks literally of His Flesh and Blood as a real food, and a real drink. "In the

first part," writes Atzberger, "the food is of the present, in the second of the future; there it is given by the Father, here by the Redeemer Himself; there it is simply called "bread," here the "Flesh of the Son of Man"; there our Lord speaks only of bread, here of His Flesh and Blood; there, it is true, He calls Himself "bread," but He avoids the expression "to eat Me," where one would expect to meet it; here He speaks both of "eating Me" and of "eating My Flesh and drinking My Blood" (*Handbuch der Kath. Dogmatik*, iv., 569).

A careful study of the whole chapter calls for a literal interpretation of the words "to eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood" (John vi. 54). Christ makes a clear-cut distinction between three kinds of bread: the bread or manna of the desert (Exod. xvi. 15; John vi. 49), given by Moses to the Jews in the past to nourish the body; the Bread of Heaven or the Bread of Life (John vi. 32, 35), Christ Himself, given by the Father in the present to the Jews as an object of faith; and the Bread of Life, Christ Himself in the Eucharist, to be given in the future by Christ for the life of the world (John vi. 52).

To eat one's flesh was a familiar figure among the Jews of old, as it is a common figure among the Arabs of to-day, but it always means to do a person some serious injury, especially by calumny or by false accusation. Is it not absurd to imagine that our Lord would promise eternal life and a glorious resurrection to those who calumniated Him?

To drink one's blood was also a familiar figure among the Jews, but it always meant a chastisement of God (Isa. xlix. 26; Apoc. xvi. 6) upon His enemies, a meaning impossible here.

The Jews certainly understood our Lord literally, for they said: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" (John vi. 53). Our Lord's reply to them proves that He meant them to do so. We must remember that Christ, like every good teacher, made two sorts of answers to men who objected to His teaching. If they did not understand His meaning, He explained His doctrine more fully. In this way He explains Baptism to Nicodemus (John iii. 3, 5), the possibility of the rich man being saved (Matt. xix. 24-26), the fact of Lazarus' death (John xi. 11-14), the idea of freedom (John viii. 32-34; Cf. John iv. 31-34; viii. 21-23).

When His hearers understood His teaching but refused to accept it, He repeated His teaching with even more emphasis. Thus He insisted upon His power to forgive sins, when the Scribes accused Him of blasphemy (Matt. ix. 2-7), and insisted upon His being Eternal, when the Jews said He was not yet fifty years old (John viii. 56-58).

In like manner He acted with the Jews who objected to His teaching about the Real Presence. When they objected: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" He did not explain His doctrine in a figurative sense, but He repeated the doctrine that gave offence in a most emphatic manner. He puts His doctrine in the form of a precept: "Except you eat of the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you"; and declares "My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed." He tells them that this eating and drinking is a pledge of everlasting life, a bond of intimate union with Him, an earnest of supernatural life here and of resurrection hereafter (John vi. 54-59).

When many of the disciples still refused to accept this doctrine, saying: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it" (John vi. 61), Christ did not retract His words, and say that He spoke merely in figure. On the contrary, He rebuked them for their lack of faith, and asked them to accept His words, because He came from heaven, and would one day "ascend up where He was before." The unbelieving Jews "walked no more with Him," but the faithful Apostles, who did not comprehend the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, humbly accepted Christ's word. Peter answered for them: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known, that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John vi. 62-70).

The doctrine of the Fathers on the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist may be studied in Berington's *The Faith of Catholics*, ii., 190-374; Batiffol's *Etudes d'Histoire*, ii., 107-383; and Lattey's *Catholic Faith in the Eucharist*, i., 2-72. They hold that the Body of Christ is really present in the Eucharist: they cite the doctrine of the Real Presence to refute the various heresies of their time on the Incarnation; they expressly deny that the Eucharist is a mere figure of Christ's Body; they assert that Christ is received in Communion, physically and corporeally. St. Ignatius writes: "They (the Docetæ) abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised up" (*Ad Smyrn.*, 7).

St. Justin writes: "We have been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which came from Him—by which (food) our blood and flesh are nourished by transmutation—is both Flesh and Blood of that same Incarnate Jesus (*Apol.*, i., 65, 66).

St. Irenæus writes: "How shall they feel assured that that

bread over which thanksgiving has been made is the Body of their Lord, and the chalice of His Blood, if they do not declare Him the Son of the world's Creator?" (*Adv. Her.* iv., 18.)

Theophylact writes: "Saying, 'This is My Body,' He showed that the bread sanctified upon the altar is the very Body and not a figure; for He did not say, 'This is a figure,' but, 'This is My Body'" (*In Matt.*, viii., 26).

St. Cyril of Alexandria writes: "Just as a person who joins one piece of wax to another and applies both to the fire, makes the compound of both one, so by means of our participation of the Body of Christ and of His Precious Blood, He is indeed in us, and we are united in Him" (*In Joann.*, i., 4).

117. Does not Christ plainly indicate that He is speaking figuratively in the sixth chapter of St. John when He says: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John vi. 63)?

The words flesh and spirit, when opposed to each other in the New Testament never mean literal and figurative, but always the corrupted dispositions of sinful human nature (flesh) contrasted with human nature enriched by the grace of God (spirit). (*Matt.* xxvi. 41; *Rom.* vii. 5, 6, 25; viii. 1-14; *1 Cor.* v. 5; *2 Cor.* vii. 1; *Gal.* iii. 3; iv. 29; v. 13-26; *1 Peter* iii. 18; iv. 6). Christ's meaning, therefore, is clear: My words are such as the mere carnal man cannot receive, but only the man endowed with grace. St. Chrysostom says: "Why, therefore did He say: The flesh profiteth nothing? Not of His flesh does He mean this. Far from it; but of those who would understand what He said in a carnal sense.....You see, there is question not of His flesh, but of the fleshly way of hearing" (*In Joann.*, xlvii., 2).

118. Ought not the words of Christ at the Last Supper be interpreted in a figurative sense?

The Catholic Church has always interpreted the words: "This is My Body; This is My Blood," which occur in the four accounts of the Last Supper, in a strictly literal sense (*Council of Trent*, Sess. xiii., cap. 2, 4). No explanation of these simple words can make their meaning clearer. Christ says that what He holds in His hands is His Body and we, like the Apostles, humbly accept His word. The literal sense is the obvious sense, and was in possession from the beginning. The denial of the Sacramentarians came over 1500 years too late, and went counter

to the constant voice of Christian tradition. By the year 1577 there were some 200 different interpretations of these words current among the Reformers, which proves how hard pressed they were to defend their arbitrary explanations. Luther till the very end of his life maintained the literal interpretation of these words against the Sacramentarians, Zwingli, Carlstadt, and Oecolampadius, although like all heretics, he illogically waged bitter war against the Sacrifice of the Mass (Grisar, *Luther*, ii., 89, 320 ; iii., 380, 395, 492-496 ; iv., 506-518). In fact he said he was tempted to deny the Real Presence in order "to give a great smack in the face of Popery," but the teaching of the Bible and all antiquity were too strong in its favour.

A figure of speech is always known to us either from the nature of the case, or from the usages of a language. For example, I may refer to a man's cunning by calling him a fox, or to his bravery by calling him a lion. Again I may hold in my hand a photograph of the President of the United States, and say : "This is Mr. Roosevelt." In both instances my meaning will be evident at once. But in no way is bread the fitting or possible symbol of the human body. Christ plainly excluded any possibility of a figurative meaning to His words when He said : "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh for the life of the world" (John vi. 52). St. Luke's account tells us that Christ spoke of His body as "given for you," and of His blood as "shed for you" (Luke xxii. 19, 20). Therefore the Body given to the Apostles was the same Body that was crucified on the Cross, and the chalice contained the same Blood that was shed for our sins.

The words of the institution were spoken on the night preceding our Lord's Passion and Death. The Holy Eucharist was His last Will and Testament (Luke xxii. 20). It was a Sacrament and a Sacrifice to be celebrated in His Church until the end of time (1 Cor. xi. 26). The words of a will should be clear, and interpreted in their natural, literal sense (Gen. xlix. 29 ; 3 Kings ii. 2 ; Tob. iv. 3 ; 1 Mach. ii. 49). Would Christ, the Infinite God and Lover of souls, use a figure of speech that would deceive millions of His followers for all time, and lead them into the very idolatry He came to abolish? The sacraments and sacrifices of the Old Law were established in plain terms. Why not then the more important Sacrament and Sacrifice of the New Law, which Christ was leaving us as a pledge of our supernatural life here and hereafter (John vi. 58, 59)?

St. Paul certainly interpreted the words of the institution literally. He writes : "The Chalice of Blessing which we bless,

is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? And the Bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?" (1 Cor. x. 16). He is contrasting the Jewish and the pagan sacrifices with the Sacrifice of the Christians, and arguing against any participation in the pagan sacrificial banquets. The reason given is that partaking of the Consecrated Chalice unites us to the Blood of Christ, and partaking of the Consecrated Bread unites us to the Body of Christ. If the pagan banquet and sacrifice are real, so are the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice.

He states the doctrine of the Real Presence even more plainly in 1 Cor. xi. 27-29. He writes: "Therefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink the Chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and of the Blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of the Chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord."

If our Lord is not present in Communion, these words of the Apostle are utterly meaningless. Because Christ is really present, the Apostle warns the sinner to cleanse his conscience of sin, for an unworthy Communion merits God's condemnation or judgment.

119. Is not the doctrine of the Real Presence impossible?

The doctrine of the Real Presence is undoubtedly a great mystery like the Creation, the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, but it is not impossible, because it does not imply any self-contradiction. If God can create the universe out of nothing, why cannot He change the substance of bread and wine into His Body and Blood? The true follower of Christ does not ask how can this man give us His Flesh to eat with the unbelieving Jew (John vi. 53), but accepts Christ's word humbly as the Apostles did (John vi. 69, 70). The Apostles who had witnessed the transubstantiation of water into wine at Cana in Galilee (John ii. 1-11), and the feeding of the five thousand with five barley loaves and fishes (John vi. 1-14) never questioned Christ's power to change bread and wine into His Flesh and Blood.

Non-Catholics declare the doctrine of the Real Presence impossible, because they think it involves a self-contradiction. They suppose that it requires the same thing to be both bread and not bread at the same time. This is not the Catholic teaching. After Consecration the species of bread is not really bread, but

the Body of Christ, for the substance of the bread has been changed into the substance of Christ's Body. What is not changed is the "accidents or the sensible qualities of the bread; viz., its colour, taste," etc. But the reality of a thing lies in its substance, the invisible part of it, not in the accidents, or visible part. St. Cyril stated this clearly: "Being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread, even though it seems so to the taste, but Christ's Body; and what seems wine is not wine, even though the taste will have it so, but Christ's Blood" (*Cat.*, iv., 9).

The substance of Christ's Body in the Eucharist has none of the sensible qualities of a human body; it is not extended so as to occupy space, although it is united with accidents which do occupy space. Contrary to physical laws, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent says, "they subsist of themselves, inhering in no subject." It would, therefore, be wrong to say: "The Body of Christ is round" or "The Blood of Christ has a light colour," for these expressions are to be used with regard to the accidents alone. This is certainly a mysterious doctrine, hard to understand, because there is nothing like it in all our experience. But the mysteries of Christianity are all unique, because they pertain to divine things. We accept them on the testimony of God (1 John v. 9), and on the infallible witness of Christ's divine Church.

120. How can the Body of Christ be in so many places at once?

The Council of Trent has defined against the Reformers this multilocation of the Body of Christ. "For neither are these things mutually repugnant,—that our Saviour Himself always sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He is in many other places, sacramentally present to us in His own substance, by a manner of existing which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet by the understanding, illuminated by faith, we can conceive, and ought most firmly to believe, is possible to God" (Sess. xiii., cap. 1).

Father Dalgairns thus answers this question: "The whole question resolves itself into this—can a body be unextended? Who will say that God cannot take from a body the property of extension? What contradiction is there in it? Is it not easy for us to conceive substance without extension? If we take to pieces the idea of substance, we shall find that it is quite independent of quantity, on which extension depends; for the smallest grain of gold is as really and

substantially gold, as all the precious metal contained in the whole universe. Again, quantity is a sensible thing which is seen by the eye and felt by the touch; but as for substance, it is revealed to us by the mind alone. Let God but only reduce a body to the state of pure substance, and it ceases at once to be extended, without ceasing to be a body. It is by extension that a body becomes subject to the laws of space; take extension away, and it partakes at once of some of the prerogatives of spirit.

121. Why do you go counter to the Bible (John vi. 54; 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29) and the institution of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 27), by denying the cup to the laity in Communion?

The Catholic Church, in prescribing Communion under one kind at the Councils of Constance and of Trent, did not in any way go counter to the teaching of Christ or St. Paul, or in any way destroy the essence of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. The Council of Trent teaches: "Laymen, and clerics when not celebrating, are not obliged by any divine precept to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds, neither can it by any means be doubted, without injury to faith, that Communion under either kind is sufficient for them unto salvation" (Sess. xxi., ch. 1).

It is easy to understand how Protestants who do not believe in the real objective presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, and who do believe that the essence of the Sacrament consists in eating mere bread and drinking mere wine, should insist on receiving under both kinds. Catholics, however, who believe that the Eucharist is the living Jesus Christ, are certain that they receive not His Body alone under the form of bread, nor His Blood alone under the form of wine, but His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity under either form (Sess. xiii., can. 3).

The sixth chapter of St. John presents no difficulty, for as the Council of Trent pointed out, the Lord promised the same reward for Communion under one kind as under both. "He who said: 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you' (John vi. 54), also said: 'He that eateth this Bread shall live forever' (John v. 59); and He who said: 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood shall have everlasting life' (John v. 55), also said: 'The Bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world' (John v. 52); and finally, He who said: 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me and I in

him' (John v. 57), said nevertheless: 'He that eateth this Bread shall live forever' (John v. 59; Sess. xxi., cap. 1).

When Christ said to the Apostles: "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. xxvi. 27), He was speaking not to the laity, but to priests, who in celebrating Mass, as He ordered, always partake of Communion under both kinds. The Eucharist is both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. For the Sacrifice of the Mass a double Consecration is necessary, for it commemorates the Sacrifice of the Cross. Its Priest is the Priest of Calvary, its Victim is the Victim of Calvary, and its mode of offering is a mystic representation of the blood-shedding of Calvary. Protestants, having abolished the Mass, naturally do not understand the Catholic doctrine of Communion.

Our Lord did not prescribe any special mode of Communion any more than He prescribed any special mode of Baptism. The Council of Trent taught that, whereas all the Sacraments were instituted by Christ, He did not prescribe all the acts and words to be used in each Sacrament, as we learn from the Sacrament of Orders. "This power has been in the Church, that, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, their substance being untouched, it may ordain or change what things soever it may judge most expedient for the profit of those who receive, or for the veneration of the said Sacraments" (Sess. xxi., ch. 3).

While, therefore, Communion under both kinds was the common custom for twelve centuries—it is still so in the Eastern Rites—the Church always approved the concurrent custom of receiving the Holy Eucharist under either kind.

The present law of receiving Communion under the form of bread dates from the Council of Constance in 1414, which condemned the Hussites of Bohemia for teaching that the cup was absolutely necessary. This law was confirmed by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi., ch. 1), which condemned the false teaching of the Reformers on this point. Long before the law was passed, however, the custom of receiving Communion under the form of bread had become widespread for practical reasons. These "grave and just reasons," mentioned by the Council of Trent, were: The risk of spilling the Precious Blood; the difficulty of reserving Communion under the species of wine; the dread of drinking from a chalice touched by infected lips; the cost of obtaining wine for thousands of communicants.

Were any doctrine involved, no difficulty would have prevented the Church from insisting upon the observance of a divine law. As it involved merely a question of discipline, she was ever ready, as the guardian of the Sacraments, to adapt her

laws for their administration to the changing conditions of the times.

122. What do Catholics mean by the Mass ?

When the Reformers in England and on the continent denied the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Council of Trent thus declared the Church's teaching (Sess. xxii., chs. 1-3 ; canons 1-5) :

1. There is in the Catholic Church a true Sacrifice, the Mass, instituted by Jesus Christ,—the Sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine.

2. This Sacrifice is identical with the Sacrifice of the Cross, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is Priest and Victim in both ; the only difference lies in the manner of offering, which is bloody upon the Cross and bloodless on our altars.

3. It is a propitiatory Sacrifice, atoning for our sins, and the sins of the living and of the dead in Christ, for whom it is offered.

4. Its efficacy is derived from the Sacrifice of the Cross, whose infinite merits it applies to us.

5. Although offered to God alone, it may be celebrated in honour and memory of the saints.

6. The Mass was instituted at the Last Supper when Christ about to offer Himself on the altar of the Cross by His death (Heb. xi. 5). for our redemption (Heb. ix. 12), wished to endow His Church with a visible Sacrifice, commemorative of His Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. As High Priest, according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix. 9), He offered to His Father His own Body and Blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and constituted His Apostles priests of the New Testament to renew this same offering until He came again (1 Cor. xi. 26) by the words, "Do this in commemoration of Me" (Luke xxii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 34).

123. I cannot understand how the Mass can be a true Sacrifice.

The Church has never defined in what manner Christ is a Victim in the Mass, but has left this question to the speculations of her theologians. Some make Him a true Victim by endowing Him with new conditions, either of a physical or a moral order, so as to lower His status, or to lessen His activities (De Lugo, Franzelin). Others hold that the mere symbol of immolation, coupled with His Real Presence, is a Sacrifice, because it recalls the bloodstained immolation of Calvary

(Vasquez), or because it shows Christ under the appearance of death (Billot). A third school maintains that the Mass implies a virtual slaying of Christ, the words of Consecration having the power to separate the Body and Blood, were it not for the fact that Christ's Body is now glorified (Lessius, Billuart). A fourth school which seems to have been the traditional view up to the time of the Council of Trent is thus stated by its ablest defender, the Jesuit, Maurice de la Taille: "The Mass is a Sacrifice and a true Sacrifice, in so far as, by means of a symbolic immolation, it is a true and actual oblation of a true Victim, although it contains no real immolation of Christ actually performed by us, but only a symbolic one coupled with that state of Victim, perennial and celestial, due to the one real and bloody immolation undergone by Christ in days gone by. The Mass is a Sacrifice, it is our oblation of the Victim once immolated, even as the Supper was the oblation of the Victim to be immolated" (*The Last Supper and Calvary*, 8).

124. Where do you find the Mass in the Bible? or in primitive Christianity?

Malachias, the last of the Prophets, foretold the abolition of the Mosaic sacrifices, and the establishing of a new Sacrifice, which was to be offered up everywhere. The words used by the prophet—*muctar*, *muggas*, *mincha*—are used over three hundred times in the Old Testament in the sense of a real sacrifice; they are never used to mean a mere internal worship of praise and thanksgiving. He says: "I have no pleasure in you (the priests), saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles and in every place there is Sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation; for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Mal. i. 10, 11).

The sacrificial character of the Mass is proved from Christ's words in consecrating the chalice. St. Luke's words: "This is the chalice, the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you" clearly mean that the Blood contained in the chalice is shed at the present time for you (Luke xxii 20). St. Matthew: "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many unto remission of sins" (xxvi. 28), and St. Mark: "This is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many" (xiv. 24), also declare that Christ's Blood is being shed for us. The shedding of blood for remission of sins is a real sacrifice. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you

upon the altar to make atonement, for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life" (Lev. xvii. 11).

The consecration of the bread affords another proof of the sacrificial character of the Mass. The words, "This is My Body, which is given for you" (Luke xxii. 19), or "which is delivered for you" (1 Cor. xi. 24), clearly show that Christ offered Himself up to death.

When the priest at Mass to-day consecrates the Body and Blood of Christ, he offers up to God the Victim of the Passion. St. Cyprian in the third century wrote: "The Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice we offer" (*Epis.*, lxiii., 17). At Mass the priest does what Christ did at the Last Supper. "Do this for the commemoration of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 24). When Christ consecrated the bread and wine into His Body and Blood He offered up His death, so that the priest, consecrating at Mass, also offers up Christ's death.

" 'This is My Body,' He says, 'which is delivered up for you,'—delivered unto death. 'This is My Blood, which is shed for you,' in atonement for your sins. 'My Blood which flows for you': is that not death? Death indeed put before us in a symbol, by means of that sacramental parting of the Blood from the Body; but death at the same time pledged to God for all its worth, as well as all its awful reality, by the expressive language of that sacred symbol. The price of our sins shall be paid on Calvary; but here the liability is incurred by our Redeemer, and subscribed in His very Blood. The Flesh of the Lamb is consigned in God's hands, for as much as it is assigned as our ransom. Christ is bound for His Passion, from which it is henceforth impossible for Him to step back without taking from God what He has given to God, and thus violating that principle of justice according to which everyone is bound to render unto God the things that are God's" (*Catholic Faith in the Eucharist*, 117).

The whole argument of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 16-21 supposes that the Christians have a Sacrifice of their own, which is far superior to the Pagan and Jewish sacrifices, for it enables the Christian to partake of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

"Why partake of the table (altar) of devils," He asks them, "when you can be partakers of the table (altar) of the Lord?" It is a grievous sin of idolatry to share in the sacrificial banquets of the pagans, for this unites you with the altar, the sacrificing priest, and the victim slain. The chalice of benediction and the bread which we break unites us with the Blood of Christ, and makes us partakers of His Body—by Communion we are united to the altar, the sacrificing priest and the Victim slain.

Unless there was at Corinth a Christian Sacrifice of the Mass, the comparison of the Apostle would be utterly meaningless.

The Teaching of the Twelve—a catechism written in Greek about the year 90—mentions the Eucharistic Sacrifice: "Having assembled together on the Lord's day, break bread and give thanks, having confessed your sins beforehand in order that your Sacrifice may be pure" (xiv.).

St. Justin Martyr (160) identifies the Eucharist with the "clean oblation," the *mincha* of Malachias, a term which generally suggested the idea of a strict offering. He also speaks of the Eucharist as fulfilling the type of the flour-offering presented by a leper (Lev. xiv.). "The oblation of the flour, which was commanded to be offered up for those cleansed from leprosy was a type of the Bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ commanded us to celebrate. . . . Concerning those Sacrifices which are offered to Him in every place by us Gentiles, that is, the Bread of the Eucharist, and similarly the Cup of the Eucharist" (*Dial. Cum. Tryph.*, 41).

St. Irenæus (140-202) represents the Eucharist as a true Sacrifice, and asserts that Christ Himself is the Victim offered. "The Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to Him with thanksgiving things of His creation. But the Jews do not offer; their hands are full of blood, for they have not received the Word, who is offered to God" (*Adv. Hær.*, iv., 18, 4).

St. Irenæus plainly mentions the Consecration and the Communion. He writes: "For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God (Consecration), is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist . . . so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist (Communion), are no longer corruptible, holding the hope of resurrection to eternity" (*Ibid.*, iv., 18, 5).

Tertullian (160-220) writes: "Will not your fast be more solemn, if you stand at the altar of God? When you receive the Body of the Lord, you place in security both the participation in the Sacrifice and the fulfilment of duty" (*De Oratione*, xix.). "Was it not because He had to be led like a lamb to the slaughter, because, as a sheep before her shearer is dumb, so was He not to open His mouth, that He so intensely wished (in eating the Pasch) to accomplish the symbol of His own redeeming Blood," (*Adv. Marcion*, iv., 40).

St. Cyprian (200-258) in the third century sets forth the Catholic doctrine on the Mass as clearly as a theologian of the twentieth. He teaches that the Eucharist is a true and complete Sacrifice: that it contains an immolated Victim; that it

was taught and founded by Christ; that it is a commemoration of the Lord's Passion, and is identical with that Passion; that in it the Blood of Christ is offered; that it is a symbol of the Communion of the people with Christ; that it is offered for the living and the dead. He writes: "Christ is the Teacher and Founder of this Sacrifice. . . . Who more a priest than Jesus Christ, who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing which Melchisedech offered, that is, bread and wine, namely His Body and Blood. . . . For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, surely that priest discharges the office of Christ who imitates what Christ did; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice to God the Father in the Church, when he proceeds to offer it according to the manner in which he sees Christ to have offered. . . . Because we make mention of the Passion in all Sacrifices (for the Lord's Passion is the Sacrifice which we offer), we ought to do nothing else but what He did. For the Sacred Scriptures say, as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye show forth the Lord's death until He come. . . . The Blood of Christ is not offered up, if there be no wine in the cup. . . . In the wine is shown the Blood of Christ. . . . When the water is mingled with the wine in the Cup, the people are made one with Christ" (Epist. 63).

125. Is not the Mass derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross?

The Mass is not derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as the Council of Trent has defined (Sess. xxi., can. 4). The Catholic Church has always taught the all-sufficiency of the one Sacrifice of our redemption. The fullness of the price once paid, the Blood of Christ, makes all other payment impossible; the immolation of Calvary renders all repetition useless. But "immolation is only one element of sacrifice, and indeed not the one that has to be performed by the priest, or sacrificer. The priestly element is oblation. The oblation has been performed by Christ, St. Thomas remarks, in such wise, that it may be renewed by us. The immolation has been done once, and need not be repeated, and cannot be repeated. But the offering can, and should be, of daily recurrence, according to Christ's command: "This do for the commemoration of Me" (1 Cor. xi. 24). Now the Sacrifice being not the mactation or immolation, but the offering up of what is either slain or to be slain, it follows that our daily celebration is also a daily Sacrifice" (De la Taille, *Catholic Faith in the Eucharist*, 113, 114).

126. Why do you exact a fixed sum to get people out of Purgatory by your Masses? Does not a rich man thereby have an unjust advantage over a poor man ?

In the primitive Church the faithful offered bread and wine at each Mass they attended, often placing money upon the altar for the use of the clergy and the poor. The practice of giving the priest a money alms for a Mass dates from the seventh or eighth century, and became a universal practice in the twelfth.

The Scriptures prove that by divine law the Church has the right to demand from the people the support of the clergy (Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 7, 14). But the custom of accepting stipends for Masses is proved only by tradition, *i.e.*, the Church's approval for the past twelve hundred years. As the divine teacher of Christ's revelation, she cannot make any universal law contrary to the natural or positive divine law.

Non-Catholics generally suppose that five hundred Masses have five hundred times the efficacy of one. This is not the case. The value of the Mass is infinite, because Christ is the Minister of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. He delegates the priest to act in His name, and actually performs Himself the sacrificial action in each Mass. But while the merits presented to God in the Mass are infinite, their application to individuals is finite, and only to be measured by the acceptance of God. We know in a general way that God will answer our prayers, but how He will apply the fruit of a particular Mass, we do not pretend to know. The Church at every Mass remembers all her children, living and dead; the particular application of the infinite merits of Christ are known to God alone. The rich in giving alms have no advantage over the poor, for each one is bound to give alms in proportion to his means. If he were to neglect giving alms, he would be in a far worse position than the poor man, who cannot give what he does not possess.

127. Why do you say Mass in Latin, a language the people do not understand ?

A coloured Catholic of Richmond once told me that he answered this question put him by a Methodist minister by asking another: "Does not the Lord understand Latin?" A perfect answer, because it reminded his questioner that the Mass was a sacrificial action performed by the priest, as the representative of Christ, and, therefore, something utterly distinct from a sermon addressed to the people.

The language of the Mass prayers is in itself unimportant,

for the Church has never found fault with the Uniate Churches for using other languages. Thus, for example, the Italo-Greeks of Southern Italy have said Mass in Greek for over a thousand years, while the Melkites of Syria, Palestine and Egypt use Arabic and Greek. The Byzantine rite is used by the Eastern Orthodox Church in fourteen different languages, but the Mass is the same in all.

Greek was originally the language of the Roman liturgy, Latin superseding it by the beginning of the fifth century. Conservative Rome and the nations of the West converted by her missionaries, retained the Latin tongue in the Mass, to strengthen the bond of unity, and to express her unchanging worship in an idiom free from the perpetual changes of the vernacular. Imagine English-speaking Catholics of to-day compelled to decipher an obsolete English liturgy of the days of King Alfred the Great !

Even the most ignorant Catholic knows the central part of the mass, the Consecration of our Lord's Body and Blood, and by constant attendance he soon comes to know the most important prayers which precede and follow it. Moreover, the whole liturgy is translated to-day in almost every language of the world, and books explaining its every part abound. While many intelligent Catholics read the Missal with the priest, this is not essential. One may attend Mass with profit and devotion by meditating on the Passion of Christ, by reciting prayers in honour of our Lady and the saints in union with Christ, or by reading a spiritual book.

128. What constitutes the Sacrament of Penance?

On the part of the priest the *absolution*: "I absolve thee from thy sins in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." On the part of the penitent, *contrition*, i.e., sorrow of heart and detestation of sin committed, with the resolve to sin no more; *confession*; i.e., the declaration of sins to a priest with the purpose of obtaining forgiveness; and *satisfaction*, i.e., the payment of the temporal punishment due forgiven sins (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., 3).

129. How do you prove from the Bible that the Catholic Church has the power to forgive sin?

Christ promised St. Peter and the Apostles the power to forgive sin (Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 18), and fulfilled that promise on the first Easter evening (John xx. 21-23).

The power of the keys implied supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church, and necessarily included the power to forgive

sin, because sin alone excludes men from the kingdom of heaven. God ratified this power in St. Peter, the other Apostles and their successors, when he said: "Whatsoever thou shalt (you shall) bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, whatsoever thou shalt (you shall) loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18).

This promise was fulfilled when Christ said: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. When he had said this, He breathed on them, and He said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained" (John xx. 21-23).

Why had the Father sent Him? To save sinners by pardoning their sins. "I am not come to call the just but sinners" (Matt. ix. 13). "I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24). "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" (Matt. xviii. 11). "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. i. 21). "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Tim. i. 15).

He frequently pardoned sinners; *viz.*, Magdalen (Luke vii. 47), the woman in adultery (John viii. 11), Zacheus (Luke xix. 9), the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2), the thief on the Cross (Luke xxiii. 43). The pardoning power which He exercised He bestowed upon His Apostles. As the Father had sent Him to pardon, so He sent them to pardon in His Name.

Was this pardoning power to cease with the Apostles? By no means. The very nature of the Church, which is the representative of Christ to continue His work until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20), proves that the pardoning power was not a personal gift to the Apostles, but a permanent institution, to last as long as there were sinners in the world (Council of Trent, Sess. viv., can. 3).

130. Was not the practice of Auricular Confession introduced by Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, as Calvin maintained?

No, the Council of Trent expressly mentions this statement of Calvin as "a vain calumny," and adds: "The Church did not, through the Lateran Council, ordain that the faithful of Christ shall confess—a thing which it knew to be necessary and instituted of divine right—but that the precept of Confession should be complied with at least once a year" (Sess. xiv., ch. 5).

Confession is not a human institution of Pope or Council,

but a divine institution observed in the Church from the beginning. "If anyone denies either that Sacramental Confession was instituted, or is necessary for salvation by divine right, or says that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church has observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention, let him be anathema" (Council of Trent, Sess. xiv., can. 6).

No one denies that Confession to-day is observed as a divine law everywhere in the Catholic Church, and that it has been universally observed in both East and West since the twelfth century. If a Pope or a General Council had instituted such a distasteful duty, there would have been a general protest against it at some period in Church history. There is no such record.

The Eastern Orthodox Church, which first separated from Rome in the ninth century, and the Lesser Eastern Churches which seceded in the fifth, have all retained Confession as a divine institution.

The mediæval penitential books contain practical directions for hearing confessions; they urge the confessor to warn the penitent not to conceal his secret sins of even thought and desire, but to confess them as if he were speaking to God. The oldest, the penitential of Vinivianus (570), comes from Ireland.

St. Cæsarius of Arles (470-542) writes: "It is God's will that we confess our sins not only to Him but to men, and since it is impossible for us to be free from sin, we must never fail to have recourse to the remedy of Confession" (Ser. ccliii. 1). In another sermon on the Last Judgment (ccl.), he tells his hearers "to escape damnation by making a sincere Confession from the bottom of their hearts, and to fulfil the penance given by the priest."

St. Leo the Great (440-461) writes: "God in His abundant mercy has provided two remedies for the sins of men: that they may gain eternal life by the grace of Baptism, and also by the remedy of Penance. Those who have violated the vows of their Baptism may obtain the remission of their sins by condemning themselves; the divine goodness has so decreed that the pardon of God can only be obtained by sinners through the prayers of the priests. Jesus Christ Himself has conferred upon the rulers of the Church the power of imposing canonical penance upon sinners who confess their sins, and of allowing them to receive the Sacraments of Christ, after they have purified their souls by a salutary satisfaction. . . . Every Christian, therefore, must examine his conscience, and cease deferring from

day to day the hour of his conversion; he ought not to expect to satisfy God's justice on his deathbed. It is dangerous for a weak and ignorant man to defer his conversion to the last uncertain days of his life, when he may be unable to confess and obtain priestly absolution; he ought, when he can, to merit pardon by a full satisfaction for his sins" (*Epis. cviii*).

St. Augustine (354-430) tells the early Christians "not to listen to those who deny that the Church has the power to forgive all sins" (*De Agon. Christ*, 3; Ser. 295, 2). He compares the sinful conscience to an abscess filled with pus, the priest to a surgeon, and Confession to the lancing of the abscess, whereby the pus is driven forth. He warns sinners not to delay their Confession to the hour of death, because at that time they may be unable to confess their sins to a priest (*In. Ps.*, lxvi. 5; Ser. 393).

St. Ambrose (340-397) declares that priests pardon all sins, not in their own name, but as "ministers and instruments of God" (*De Poen.*, i., 2).

St. Pacian of Barelona (390), answering the objection of the Novatians that God alone can forgive sins, writes: "This is true, but that which He does through His priests is also done by His own power. For He said to His Apostles: 'Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven. Why should He speak thus, if it was not lawful for men to bind and loose?'" (*Epis. Ad Symp.*, i., 6).

Paulinus of Milan (395), in his life of St. Ambrose, explicitly mentions the fact that the saint heard confessions. He writes: "As often as anyone, in order to receive penitence, confessed his falls to him, he wept so as to compel him also to weep.... But he spoke of the causes of the crimes which they confessed to none but the Lord alone" (*Vita Ambrosii*, 39).

The historian Socrates tells us that on occasion of the Novatian schism (251), the Bishops of Thrace decided to appoint in every place a Priest Penitentiary to take the Bishop's place; *i.e.*, a priest to hear confessions, and to see that the penitents accomplished the penance imposed upon them (*Hist. Eccles.*, v., 19).

Origen (185-254) in his commentary on Psalm xxvii. plainly speaks of a secret Confession. He writes: "When you have eaten some indigestible food, and your stomach is filled with an excessive quantity of humour, you will suffer until you have gotten rid of it. So in like manner sinners who hide and retain their sins within their breasts, become sick therefrom almost to death. If, however, they accuse themselves, confess their sins, and vomit forth their iniquity, they will completely drive from their souls the principle of evil. Consider carefully whom you choose to

hearken to your sins. Know well the character of the physician to whom you intend to relate the nature of your sickness....If he gives you advice, follow it; if he judges that your sickness is of such a nature that it should be revealed publicly in church for the edification of the brethren and your own more effective cure, do not hesitate to do what he tells you."

St. Cyprian (200-258) also mentions secret Confession in his treatise *De Lapsis*. 28,19. During the persecution of Decius (249-251) many Christians had apostatized, either by offering sacrifice to idols (*sacrificati*), or by obtaining official certificates, falsely declaring that they had done so (*libellatici*). The saint urges those guilty even of sins of thought to confess them. He writes: "Although these Christians have not committed the crime of either the *sacrificati* or the *libellatici*, yet because they have thought of apostatizing, they are bound to accuse themselves in all simplicity and sorrow to the priests of the Lord, to fulfil their public penance, and to unburden their sins....Let each one of you confess his sins, while his confession may still be received, and his satisfaction and the absolution of the priest are pleasing to the Lord."

That the Catholic Church claimed the pardoning power over all sins is evident from the Edict of Pope Callistus (217-222), mentioned by Tertullian (160-220) in the opening chapter of his book on Modesty. He writes: "I hear that there has been an Edict set forth, and a peremptory one, too. The *Pontifex Maximus*—that is, the Bishop of Bishops—issues an Edict; 'I remit the sins both of adultery and fornication to such as have fulfilled (the requirements of) penance.'" Whether this proves a profound revolution in the Church's penitential discipline which hitherto had excommunicated in perpetuity Christians guilty of the three capital sins of murder, apostasy and impurity (Vacandard, Batiffol, Rauschen) or merely sanctioned the traditional discipline rejected by the third century Montanists (d'Alès) is immaterial.

131. Does not confession give the priest too much power?

Not at all. His only power is a power delegated by Christ, whose minister he is (1 Cor. iv. 1) to forgive sins in His name, and to advise, warn, threaten and encourage souls in their daily conflict with temptation and sin. He has no right whatever to pry into a penitent's private affairs. He can question him only about sin and its occasions, and the more intelligent and careful the sinner's confession, the less will he be questioned by his confessor.

132. If you possess the Apostolic power of pardoning sin, why do priests not also possess the power to work miracles, which Jesus conferred upon them ?

Because, whereas the pardoning power is an essential part of the threefold divine commission of teaching, pardoning and sanctifying the souls of men, the extraordinary gift of miracles is not essential.

133. How can a priest listen year after year to the recital of sins without his own mind becoming corrupted ?

Because God gives His priests special graces to keep their minds and hearts pure, especially by means of daily Mass, daily reading of the breviary, and frequent confession. The priest, moreover, listens to the sins of men like another Christ, with sympathy and love for the repentant sinner, who causes "more joy in heaven than the ninety-nine just that need not penance" (Luke xv. 7). The more he understands the malice of sin, and its evil effects upon the sinner, the more he hates it as the world's greatest evil.

134. Is a priest always bound to keep secret the sins revealed to him in confessions ?

Yes, a priest is bound by the natural law, the divine law and the law of the Church to keep absolutely secret whatever he hears in Confession. As early as the sixth century the Second Synod of Dovin in Armenia decreed: "A priest who reveals the confession of the penitents shall be deposed with anathema." The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) commanded confessors "not to betray the sinner in any manner, whether by word or sign or in any other way," and decreed that priests guilty of this crime "be deposed from their office, and imprisoned in a monastery for life." The New Code of Canon Law (Canon 2369) says: "The priest, who dares break the seal of confession directly, remains under excommunication reserved in most special manner to the Holy See." Priests are forbidden even to speak about what they have heard in Confession, whether in private conversation or in sermons, no matter in what form or under what pretext this is done. (*Instruction of the Holy Office*, June 19, 1915.)

This law admits of no exceptions. A priest may not break the seal of confession, either to save his own life or his own good name, to save the life of another, or to further the aims of justice.

135. Does not Confession weaken character? Is not Confession an incentive to sin by making forgiveness easy?

No, on the contrary, Confession strengthens character by its insistence upon supernatural motives for sorrow, and prevents many a sin, making the sinner realize its heinousness in the sight of God; and its disastrous consequences here and hereafter.

If Confession were an incentive to sin, how is it that wicked Catholics, who give the lie to the Church by their daily lives, rarely go to Confession, while the most virtuous Catholics go frequently? How is it that Catholic fathers and mothers are glad when their children go often to Confession, and are sorrowful when they neglect this important duty? How again can you account for the countless thousands of sinners won back to God by means of good, contrite confessions?

It is much easier to confess one's sins to God, for then the sinner may easily crave pardon without fulfilling the necessary condition. The confessor reminds the sinner that he cannot pardon him, unless he atones for the past by restoring his neighbour's good name or property, unless he is sorry from a supernatural motive, and unless he promises to avoid in the future all the proximate occasions of sin.

136. Is not Confession degrading?

Confession is not degrading, but on the contrary is one of the noblest acts of the true Christian, for it proves his willingness to be reconciled to God in the way He divinely appointed. It is indeed humiliating, but humility is a Christ-like virtue, especially calculated to conquer the pride of sin. Jesus said: "Learn of Me because I am meek and humble of heart" (Matt. xi. 29).

137. How can our sins be forgiven by merely telling them to a priest?

Our sins cannot be pardoned by merely telling them to a priest. The Sacrament of Penance also requires Contrition or sorrow for sin, and Satisfaction or atonement for sin.

The Scriptures teach plainly that God will not forgive the sinner, unless he is truly sorry for his sins (Ps. 1. 6; Isa. xlii. 15; Ecch. xviii. 31; Joel ii. 12, 13; Matt. xvi. 25; Luke vii. 36; xv. 13, 19; xviii. 3; Acts ii. 37).

The sinner's sorrow must be a true sorrow of the mind and will; it must embrace every grievous sin; it must be supreme,

hating sin as the greatest of evils; it must be inspired by supernatural grace, and based on faith, "the beginning, root and foundation of all justification" (Council of Trent, Sess. vi., ch. 8). The detestation of sin may arise from various motives; the vileness of sin itself, the fear of hell and punishments (Imperfect Contrition), or the perfect love of God (Perfect Contrition).

138. Is an Indulgence a permission to commit sin ?

No, an indulgence does not refer to sin at all, past, present or future. It is a remission of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin, granted by the Pope and the Bishops out of the Church's spiritual treasury, which is made up of the infinite redemptive merits of Jesus Christ, and the superabundant merits of the saints.

This divine power of the Church to grant indulgences may be better understood, if we compare it with the State's custom of pardoning the whole or part of the punishment inflicted by the civil law upon the criminal. The President has the right to grant a complete pardon to any criminal within the confines of the United States; the Governor to any criminal in his State. The State, moreover, remits part of a criminal's punishment for good behaviour while in prison.

The State officials may grant a criminal pardon, even if he is not sorry for his crime, out of deference to powerful friends; the Church, on the contrary, never remits the punishment unless the sinner has manifested his sorrow.

139. By what authority does your Church grant Indulgences ?

The power of the keys granted to St. Peter and his successors, and the unlimited power to bind and loose granted to St. Peter, the other Apostles and their successors (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18) included everything that barred men from heaven, i. e., sin and its punishment.

140. Were not Indulgences sold all over Europe in the Middle Ages ? Did not the Dominican Tetzel, a most wicked man, sell Indulgences in Germany in Luther's time ?

Catholic historians—Gasquet, Pastor, Janssen, Michaels, Paulus—have frequently mentioned the abuses connected with the preaching of Indulgences in the Middle Ages. The medieval pardoner, depicted by Chaucer in the *Pardoner's Tale*, was often an unscrupulous rascal, whose dishonesty and fraud were condemned

by the Bishops of the time. The Council of Trent, following the Councils of Fourth Lateran, Lyons and Vienne, condemned, in express terms "the wicked abuse of quæstors of alms," and, because of the great scandal they had given, "abolished their name and use" (Sess. xxiv.).

While Catholics believe that the building of St. Peter's in Rome was a matter of interest to the whole Catholic world, they heartily condemn with Grisar (*Luther*, i., 329) and Janssen (*History of the German People*, iii., 91) the manner of financing the Indulgence, and the exaggerations of the preachers in extolling unduly its effects and privileges.

No one believes to-day the calumnies against Tetzel's character. Luther did not speak the truth when he asserted that "Tetzel sold grace for money at the highest price." As both Pastor and Grisar point out, we must carefully distinguish between Tetzel's teaching with regard to Indulgences for the living and Indulgences applicable to the dead. With regard to Indulgences for the living, his teaching, as we know from his *Vorlegung* and his *Frankfort Theses*, was perfectly Catholic. He writes: "Indulgences do not pardon sins, but only remit the temporal punishment due to sin, when the sins have been sorrowfully confessed.... Indulgences do not detract from the merits of Christ, but substitute for expiatory penalties the expiatory sufferings of Christ.... Consequently whosoever gives alms to procure an Indulgence gives primarily for God's sake, seeing that no one can obtain an Indulgence, who has not attained to true repentance and the love of God" (Grisar, *Luther*, i., 343).

"As regard Indulgences for the dead," Pastor writes, "there is no doubt that Tetzel did, according to what he considered his authoritative instructions, proclaim as Christian doctrine that nothing but an offering of money was required to gain the Indulgence for the dead, without there being any question of contrition or confession. He also taught, in accordance with an opinion then held, that an Indulgence could be applied to any given soul with unfailing effect.... The Papal Bull of Indulgence gave no sanction whatever to this proposition. It was a vague scholastic opinion, rejected by the Sorbonne in 1482, and again in 1518, and certainly not a doctrine of the Church" (*History of the Popes*, vii., 349).

141. Are not Indulgences destructive of true religion by making Catholics trust too much in externals?

Indulgences are most helpful to true religion, for they are never granted unless one is heartily sorry for his sins, and in the state

of grace, or friendship of God. As a matter of fact they develop the sense of solidarity in Catholics by reminding them of the Communion of Saints and the infinite merits of Christ's Redemption, which make them possible. They encourage prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, urge Catholics to frequent the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, insist on the frequent visiting of churches where Christ is really present, and foster devotion to the suffering souls in Purgatory.

142. Does an Indulgence of one hundred days imply that by reciting certain prayers a sinner may free himself of a hundred days punishment in Purgatory?

No, the Church is not so silly as to speak of days or years in the hereafter. She has never defined anything with regard to the meaning of an Indulgence of so many days or years. "Historically speaking, we know the genesis of this terminology. It has arisen out of the remissions of the canonical penances which were imposed for periods of time; *v. g.*, for so many years and so many quarantines, *i. e.*, Lents. But there can be no certainty even about the theory most commonly propounded that the gaining of an Indulgence of seven years would benefit the sinner to the same extent as the performance of seven years of the old canonical penance. We have no evidence to show that the old canonical penance can be taken as a constant and absolute standard" (Thurston, *Indulgences for Sale*, 6).

143. Why do priests anoint Catholics with oil when they are dying?

Because, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xiv., ch. 1), "this Sacred Unction of the sick was instituted by Christ the Lord as a true and proper Sacrament of the New Law, insinuated indeed (*i. e.*, prefigured) in Mark vi. 13, but recommended and promulgated to the faithful by James the Apostle. 'Is any man,' he says, 'sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him' (James v. 14, 15). In which words, as the Church has learned from Apostolic tradition received from hand to hand, he teaches the matter, the form, the proper minister, and the effect of his salutary Sacrament."

St. James' words clearly describe all the essential characteristics of a Sacrament. The anointing with oil, like the ablution

in Baptism, is a visible act, while the prayer of faith said over the sick man is the form. The Apostle ascribes internal grace to the external rite, *viz.*, salvation, upraising or bodily cure, and, above all, the forgiveness of sins. The divine institution is implied in the words, "in the name of the Lord." *i.e.*, either by Christ's command, or by His power. Only God can make a visible sign bring about the forgiveness of sins.

St. James is not speaking of a miraculous gift of healing bestowed upon disciples who were not priests, but of a permanent divine institution to be administered by a priestly ministry. Freeing one from physical evils is not "saving" him in the Gospel sense, as we learn from other passages in this same Epistle (i. 21 ; ii. 14 ; iv. 12 ; v. 20). Restoration of health may follow the spiritual benefits of the anointing, when, the Council of Trent says, "it is conducive to the soul's salvation," but it is only a secondary effect of the Sacrament.

144. If Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, why is it never mentioned until the twelfth century ?

It is not true that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is never mentioned until the twelfth century. It is true that the early Fathers do not speak of it as often as they speak of Baptism, Penance or the Eucharist, but this can readily be understood. In the first place we have lost all but a few fragments of the commentaries on the Epistle of St. James by Clement of Alexandria, Didymus, St. Augustine and St. Cyril of Alexandria. The earliest commentary we possess dates from the eighth century, St. Bede's (735). Extreme Unction was always looked upon as a complement of Penance, and it was given in the early days, as now, just before the Viaticum. Even in our time we speak of a person receiving the Last Sacraments, without expressly mentioning Extreme Unction, and we have in every language five hundred treatises on the Eucharist compared to one on Extreme Unction.

Catholic scholars have pointed out many a reference to Extreme Unction, in the writers of the early Church. The first witness is Origen (185-255) who in his homily on Leviticus (ii. 43) declares that the remission of sin mentioned by St. James is of a similar nature to the remission of sins in the Sacrament of Penance.

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) in his treatise on the Priesthood (iii. 6) compares the power of priests with the power of parents. "Our parents beget us unto this life, and the priests unto the other. Parents, moreover, can neither ward off bodily death

from us, nor repulse impending disease. But priests often heal the soul when it is sick and about to perish, rendering milder the punishment of some and preventing others altogether from falling; and doing this not by teaching only, but by the aid of prayer. And not only when they regenerate us (Baptism) do they pardon our sins, but they also have power to forgive sins committed afterwards: for St. James says: 'Is any one sick among you?' etc. If Extreme Unction remits sins, it is certainly a Sacrament instituted by Christ.

Pope Innocent I in a letter (416) to Decentius, Bishop of Gubbio, cites St. James, ch. v., to prove that Extreme Unction is a Sacrament on a par with Penance and the Eucharist; that it can be administered by either priests or Bishops, although the oil is to be blessed solely by the Bishop; that the Sacrament mentioned by the Apostle remits sins.

Cæsarius of Arles (503-43) in one of his sermons condemns Christians who went to magicians to be cured of their sickness because he tells them the Church has a Sacrament that will not only heal the body, but also remit one's sins, as St. James teaches.

The Euchologium or Sacramentary of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, was written in the first quarter of the fourth century (325). This liturgical ritual contains a prayer for the blessing of the oil of the sick, which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was administered then as it is to-day for the healing of the body and the remission of sins. It reads as follows: "We invoke Thee . . . Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and we pray that Thou wilt send a healing power of the Only-Begotten from heaven upon this oil, that it may become for those anointed . . . a casting out of every disease, an antidote against every demon . . . good grace and the remission of sins, a medicine of life and safety, health and integrity of soul, body and spirit, a perfect strengthening," etc. (*Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et Liturgie*, v., 1032). Another Eastern document of the fourth century which we possess only in a Latin translation is the Sacramentary known as the Testimony of the Lord. It also contains a prayer for the consecration of the oil of the sick, which asks God, "who art the Healer of every disease and suffering . . . to send forth upon this oil . . . the fullness of Thy kind mercy, that it may heal those who are sick, and sanctify those who return, when they approach Thy faith" (*Dictionnaire*, v., 1033).

In the West the Gelasian Sacramentary (735) and the Gregorian Sacramentary, which Duchesne attributes to Pope Hadrian I.

(772-795), although its prayers were in use in St. Gregory's time (590-604), both contain prayers for the blessing of the oil of the sick.

145. Is not this Sacrament apt to frighten people to death at a critical moment ?

To defer Extreme Unction until the last moment out of fear that it may frighten our sick relatives is sinful, for this Sacrament may and often does help him to recover his health. In any case it is a divine Sacrament intended for the dying, and should, if at all possible, be administered before the patient becomes unconscious. We do not hesitate to call in another doctor for consultation, even though our action may frighten the sick man. Why, then, hesitate to call in the Divine Physician, when the soul is about to enter into eternity ?

146. What constitutes the Sacrament of Orders in your Church ? How do you prove it a Sacrament of Christ ?

The Council of Trent teaches : "If anyone says that Order, or Sacred Ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord ; that it is a kind of human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters ; or that it is only a sort of rite for choosing ministers of the word of God and the Sacraments ; let him be anathema" (Sess. xxiii., can. 3). "If anyone says that by these words : 'Do this for a commemoration of Me' (Luke xxii. 19) that Christ did not constitute the Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests offer His Body and Blood, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxii., can. 2).

At the Last Supper, Jesus Christ, the High Priest of the New Law according to the order of Melchisedech (Ps. cix. 4; Heb. vii. 11), instituted as a permanent and official act of worship the Eucharistic Sacrifice which He had just offered, and in commanding His Apostles to do what He Himself had done, gave them the power to do what He commanded; *i. e.*, to offer this self-same Sacrifice as the representatives and sharers of His Eternal priesthood. And to complete the communication of His Priesthood to His Apostle, He added on the first Easter day the other strictly sacerdotal power of forgiving and retaining sins (Sess. xxii., can. 1).

Although most likely Christ made His Apostles priests without any special ceremony (Bellarmine, *De Sac. Ord.*, i., 2), the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul mention all the elements of the Sacrament of Orders; the external symbolic

rite of the imposition of hands and prayer; the internal grace given by this rite; and its institution by Christ.

The external sign is the imposition of hands. "These (the seven deacons) they set before the Apostles, and they praying, imposed hands upon them" (Acts vi. 6). "Then they, fasting and praying, and imposing their hands upon them (Paul and Barnabas), sent them away" (Acts xiii. 3). Paul and Barnabas ordain priests for the different churches. "And when they had ordained to them priests in every church, they commended them to the Lord, in whom they believed" (Acts xiv. 22). St. Paul, writing to Timothy (1 Tim. v. 22), tells us that the Sacrament of Orders was to be handed down by an external rite: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man." *

That the imposition of hands communicates internal grace is taught clearly by St. Paul. "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of the priesthood" (1 Tim. iv. 14). "I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6).

The divine institution of Orders is also mentioned by St. Paul who says that He (Christ) "gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 11, 12).

No one has the right to teach the Gospel authoritatively, or carry on its sacred ministry, unless he is divinely commissioned as a successor of the Apostles, or a sharer in the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. "Neither does any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was" (Heb. v. 4). "How can they preach," asks St. Paul, "unless they be sent?" (Rom. v. 4), *i.e.*, divinely commissioned.

The Council of Trent declares that Orders is proved to be a Sacrament "on the testimony of the Scriptures, the Apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers" (Sess. xxiii., ch. 3).

From the earliest times we find mention of bishops, priests and deacons (Acts xx. 17-28; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8, 12; v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5, 7). St. Clement (90-99) writes: "Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ. Preaching from city to city and throughout the country, the Apostles appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons for the future Christians" (Clement, *Ad Cor.*, xliii., 2, 4). The letter of Pope Clement was placed by the Corinthians almost

on a level with the Bible, and was read in the churches for nearly seventy-five years (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iv., 23).

The Didascalia (290) tells the layman to honour and respect the Bishop as a father and a king; as the priest and the intermediary between God and man, whom the layman must not call to account, in order not to oppose God and give offence to the Lord (ch. ix.).

St. Gregory of Nyssa (395) writes: "The same power of the word renders sublime and honourable the priest, who, by the newness of Ordination, has been singled out from the multitude; he who was yesterday one of the people suddenly becomes a commander, a presiding officer, a teacher of righteousness, and the dispenser of hidden mysteries" (*Orat. in Bapt. Christi*).

St. John Chrysostom (344-407) writes: "If the pledge of the Holy Spirit no longer existed, there would be no Baptism and no remission of sins . . . nor should we consume the mysteries. . . . Nor would we have priests, because, without such a descent, Orders would be impossible" (*De Resm. Mortis*, 8).

St. Augustine (354-430) places Orders on a level with the Sacrament of Baptism. "Each is a Sacrament, and each is given to man by a certain consecration: Baptism when a man is baptized, the other when he is ordained; and for this cause, in the Catholic Church, neither can be repeated" (*Contre Epia. Parmen.*, ii., 13).

It is true that St. Peter (1 Peter ii. 9), and St. John (Apoc. i. 6), call Christians priests, because at Mass they really offer up the Sacrifice with the priest and in union with him. Although the priest by Divine Ordination alone can consecrate the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Lord, he does so as the representative of the Christian people. The Christian is also styled a priest because he offers up spiritual sacrifices; the sacrifice of one's body (Phil. iv. 18); of prayer (Heb. xiii. 15); of almsgiving (Heb. xiii. 16); of faith in Jesus Christ (Phil. ii. 17).

147. Is there the slightest proof of Episcopacy in the early Church?

The Council of Trent teaches that there is in the Catholic Church a divinely instituted hierarchy of bishops, priests and deacons; that bishops are superior to priests, and have the power of confirming and ordaining (Sess. xxiii., canons 6, 7).

As Christ established the priesthood as a permanent institution, He certainly gave some priests, i. e., bishops, the power to communicate the priesthood to others. The New Testament

plainly tells us that the Apostles were bishops, for it pictures them frequently as ordaining—the characteristic function of a bishop.

It is true that in the New Testament the words “bishop” and “priest” are used to designate the same persons (Acts xx. 17 and 28; 1 Tim. iii. 1-7 and Tit. i. 5-9; Tit. i. 5 and i. 7). It seems certain that in the beginning all the newly-founded churches did not have at their head one bishop, having priests and deacons under his jurisdiction, as we find universally by the middle of the second century. The Apostles were not attached to any special church, and Timothy and Titus were Apostolic Delegates, placed in charge of a whole section of a country. So churches like Ephesus (Acts xx. 17) and Philippi (Phil. i. 1) had a college of bishops at their head, subject either to an Apostle or his Delegate.

The Monarchical Episcopate of the second century was nothing new, for the mother church of Jerusalem had a Monarchical Bishop in St. James from the time the Apostles dispersed. Whether the church had one bishop at their head, or a college of several bishops, the Episcopate still carried on the Apostolic succession.

The letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch (98-117) mention the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons, while they bring out clearly the divine origin of the Episcopate, and its superiority over the priesthood (*Ad Magnes.*, 6; *Ad Trall.*, 2, 3, 6; *Ad Eph.*, iii., 6; *Ad Phil.*, 4). The bishop is the centre of the Church's unity, and concentrates in his hands all religious powers. “Without him there is no Baptism, no Eucharist and no agape. The college of presbyters adhere to the bishop as the strings to a lyre (*Ad Eph.*, iv., 1). Where the bishop is, there let the multitude (of believers) be; even as where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church” (*Ad Smyr.*, viii., 2).

Hegissippus (Eusebius, *Hist Eccles.*, iv., 22) wrote a polemical treatise against the Gnostics of his day (190), setting forth the evidence of ecclesiastical tradition, and emphasizing its close dependence on the uninterrupted succession of the bishops. St. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, iii., 3) traces the Roman line back to St. Peter and St. Paul, while Dionysius of Corinth traces the bishops of Athens back to St. Dionysius.

148. Why did Pope Leo XIII declare Anglican Orders null and void?

Pope Leo XIII declared in his *Apostolicæ Curæ*, September 13, 1896, that “Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican

rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void." His condemnation rests on the theological, not historical, grounds: the inherent defect of *form* in the Edwardine Ordinal used in the consecration of Parker in 1559; and the defect of *intention* in those using it.

The Pope writes: "The words which until recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination—namely, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred Order of priesthood, or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power of consecrating the offering, the true Body and Blood of the Lord, in that Sacrifice which is no 'true commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the Cross' (Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii., can. 1.; xxiv., can. 3). This form had indeed afterwards added to it (in 1662) the words 'for the office and work of a priest,' etc.; but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form (1552) was defective and inadequate. But even if this addition could give to the form its due signification, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal; for, as the hierarchy had become extinct, there remained no power of ordaining. In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all: from them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form, therefore, cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the Sacrament, which omits what it ought essentially to signify."

"The same holds good of Episcopal consecration. For to the formula 'Receive the Holy Ghost' not only were the words 'for the office and work of a bishop,' etc., added at a later period (1662), but even these must be understood in a sense different from that which they bear in the Catholic rite. . . . The Episcopate undoubtedly by the institution of Christ most truly belongs to the Sacrament of Orders, and constitutes the *severation* in the highest degree. . . . So it comes to pass that, as the Sacrament of Orders and the true *severation* of Christ were utterly eliminated from the Anglican rite, and hence the *severation* is in no wise conferred truly and validly in the Episcopal consecration of the same rite, for the like reason, therefore, the Episcopate can in no wise be truly and validly conferred by it; and this is the more so because among the first duties of the Episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy Eucharist and Sacrifice."

With regard to the defect of intention, the Pope continues: "The Church does not judge about the mind and intention, in so far as it manifested externally, she is bound to judge concerning it. When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting and conferring a Sacrament, he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite is employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse and destructive of the Sacrament."

Pope Leo also calls attention to the fact that his predecessors, Popes Julius III and Paul IV, gave an identical decision regarding the invalidity of Anglican Orders, when the case came up during the reign of Mary Tudor, and that for more than three centuries the Catholic Church has always ordained absolutely all convert Anglican ministers. He adds: "Since in the Church it has ever been a constant and established rule that it is sacrilegious to repeat the Sacrament of Orders, it never could have come to pass that the Apostolic See would have silently acquiesced and tolerated such a custom. But not only did the Apostolic See tolerate this practice, but it approved and sanctioned it, as often as any particular case arose which called for its judgment in the matter."

There is no doubt that the eliminating of all mention of the priesthood in the Edwardine Ordinal was part of that general Protestant movement, which led to the destruction of altars throughout England and the substitution of communion tables, "to move the people," as Ridley put it, "from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass." To this day many an Anglican bishop expressly states that he has no intention to make a Mass-priest when he ordains.

149. Why are Catholic priests forbidden to marry?

Clerical celibacy is not a precept of the divine or natural law; neither is it a dogma of the Catholic Church. It is simply an obligatory law of the Western Church, imposed with a view to the dignity and duties of the priesthood.

Jesus Christ, "the Prince of Virgins", praises the state of

virginity most highly. He says: "All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given . . . there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xix. 11-13).

St. Paul led a life of celibacy and recommended it, as our Saviour had done, to all who felt called to the virgin life. "I would that all men were even as myself; but every one has his proper gift from God; one after his manner, and another after that. But I say to the unmarried and the widows. It is good for them if they so continue, even as I" (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8).

The Apostle expressly teaches, however, that there is no commandment of the Lord, either to marry or to lead a life of celibacy. Both were to be the free choice^a of the Christian. "Concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel . . . Art thou bound to a wife? Seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? Seek not a wife. But if thou take a wife, thou hast not sinned, and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned" (*Ibid.*, 25-28).

Virginity, he adds, is preferable to marriage as a higher state. It enables a Christian to serve God better, and to be "holy in body and in spirit." "He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided" (*Ibid.*, 32, 33).

For the first three centuries there was no law of the Church in regard to celibacy, though, as a matter of fact, many of the clergy remained celibate. Tertullian (200), in order to deter a widow from a second marriage, reminds her of the number of those in sacred Orders who had embraced continence, and had chosen God for their spouse (*De Exh. Cast.*, xiii.).

The earliest law enforcing celibacy was passed by the Council of Elvira in Spain about the year 300. Bishops, priests and deacons were to be deposed, if they lived with their wives and begot children after their ordination. A similar decree was enacted by a Roman Council under Pope Siricius (384-399), who wrote letters to Spain and Africa insisting upon its observance. A few years later Pope Innocent I (402-417) wrote similar letters to Bishops Victricus of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse. By the time of Leo the Great (440-461) the law of clerical celibacy was obligatory throughout the West.

The Eastern Churches followed a less strict line of development. The Council of Ancyra (Canon 10) in Galatia (314) permitted deacons to marry, if before their ordination they declared their intention of not leading a life of celibacy. The

Council of Neo-Cæsarea (Canon 7) in Cappadocia (315) forbade priests to contract a new marriage under penalty of deposition. The Apostolic Constitutions (400) forbade bishops, priests and deacons to marry after their ordination, but permitted them to keep their wives. The sixth canon indeed forbade bishops and priests to put away their wives "under pretext of piety."

The custom of insisting upon a celibate episcopate in the East (*Ibid.*, v., 22) became a law under the Emperor Justinian (527-565). The custom also of allowing priests and deacons to live with the wives they had married before ordination became general about the middle of the seventh century, and was solemnly sanctioned by the Council of Trullo in 692.

This law with some slight modifications still holds good in the Eastern Churches to-day, whether uniate or schismatic.

150. Is not celibacy impossible, as the history of Confession down the ages amply proves ?

Celibacy is not impossible, and the history of Western Christendom bears witness that it has been kept by an overwhelming majority of priests. Writers like H. C. Lea, of Philadelphia, and G. G. Coulton, of Cambridge, England, take special delight in gathering together the scandals of past ages, in order to prove that celibacy is an impossible burden upon the Catholic priesthood. Their inaccuracy and unfairness have often been pointed out by Catholic scholars such as Gasquet and Thurston, but their anti-Catholic prejudice prevents their being honest in their estimates, electing certain periods of history when clerical morality was at a low ebb, they illogically endeavour to prove that the law of celibacy has always been inoperative.

Laxity of observance at certain periods will, of course, be admitted by any candid historian, but no one who knows the facts can deny that the law of celibacy has been faithfully observed from the fourth century by the vast majority of the clergy of the West.

Celibacy is not impossible, for the grace of God is given abundantly to all His priests to keep them chaste. Daily Mass, the recitation of the divine Office, the frequent meditation on divine truths, the consolations of the confessional, the intimate contact with the sick and dying—all these are aids to keep every priest faithfully to his vow. He is not chosen lightly for his sacred office, but is watched over for years by intelligent and pious seminary professors, who, only after a most careful judgment, declare him worthy of the sacred ministry.

A little common sense is all that is needed to answer the

change that celibacy is impossible. Would you dare say that all unmarried people find it impossible to be chaste? Are your own unmarried children, distant, widowed cousins, married aunts and brother-in-laws all impure? Are all husbands, who for certain seasons are separated for a long period from their wives, bound to commit adultery? To claim that celibacy is impossible is a libel on the purity of thousands of men and women. Impure men make this statement because they easily judge others by their own wicked lives. Good people believe this calumny out of honest prejudice.

Some declare that celibacy is against nature. They are right, if by nature they mean the corrupt and sensual inclinations of man's lower nature, which as St. Paul says, is continually fighting "against the law of the mind" (Rom. vii. 23). They are wrong, if they mean that all men must marry to be pure. There are thousands of pure men and women, who remain celibate out of mere natural affection for their own flesh and blood.

The scandals of history which some controversialists quote as an indictment against celibacy prove nothing whatever. A married clergy, whether in schismatic Russia, Lutheran Germany or the United States, has not been free from scandals.

Practically speaking, the Catholic Church knows from long experience that a celibate clergy can do more effective work for God's people than a married clergy. An unmarried priest is freer and more independent than a minister with a wife and family. Protestants have often admitted this to me, when arguing for a celibate ministry, either in poor country parishes or in the foreign mission field.

151. Does not your law of celibacy belittle marriage?

Not in the slightest degree. Because the Catholic Church exalts celibacy, she by no means belittles marriage. On the contrary, she regards marriage as one of the seven Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ, a Sacrament, holy in all its relations. She strongly condemns adultery, divorce, polygamy and race suicide as essentially opposed to the Christian Gospel. Virginity is for the few, while marriage is for the many; both are holy, although in different ways. The churches which have ignored Christ's counsel of virginity, have at the same time degraded marriage by their denial of its sacred character, and by their pagan views of divorce and family limitation. The Catholic Church has always been loyal to the teaching of Christ: "What God has joined together let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6).

152. Were not the monks of the Middle Ages a lazy, ignorant and immoral set of men ?

They were not. The old time calumnies of the Reformation are no longer believed by reputable and critical non-Catholic historians. A large volume could be filled with testimonies of non-Catholics, who bear eloquent testimony to monasticism's splendid contribution to civilization.

Maitland speaks of the medieval monasteries "as quiet and religious refuges for helpless infancy and old age, shelters of respectable sympathy for the orphan maiden and the desolate widow; as central points whence agriculture was to spread over bleak hills and barren downs and marshy plains, and deal bread to millions perishing with hunger and its pestilential train; as repositories of the learning which then was; and well-springs of the learning which was to be; as nurseries of art and science, giving the stimulus, the means and the reward to invention, and aggregating around them every head that could devise and every hand that could execute; as the nucleus of the city, which in after days of pride should crown its palaces and bulwarks with the towering cross of its cathedral. This, I think, no man can deny" (*The Dark Ages*, 2).

The medieval monks reclaimed millions of acres of desert and marsh land in every country of Europe; they copied thousands of manuscripts of the Bible, the early Fathers, the Greek and Latin classics; they founded many famous schools—Lerins, Marmoutier, Tours, Clonard, Clonmacnois, Bangor, Fulda, St. Gall, Reichenau, Jarrow, Wearmouth and York; they gathered together valuable libraries; they practiced every possible form of charity towards the poor, the sick, the leper, the prisoner; they won to the Church by their missionary labours England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Germany, Flanders, and the greater part of Italy. Our Lord told us to judge a tree by its fruits (Matt. vii. 17).

It of course happened at times that monasteries declined in fervour, especially when kings and nobles put their unworthy favourites in charge, but the Popes and the Bishops were ever on the alert, and reform, often inaugurated by a saint, soon became the order of the day.

153. Were not unchaste nuns walled-up alive in the Middle Ages ?

No, this is a stock calumny of anti-Catholic lecturers, whose only authority is the episode introduced into Sir Walter Scott's

poem, *Mormon*. Father Thurston, who has studied this matter thoroughly writes: "To anyone who honestly looks into the matter, it will be clear that no statutes of any religious order have yet been brought forward which prescribe such punishment; that no contemporary records speak of its infliction; that no attempt is made to give details of persons or time; that the few traditions that speak of the discovery of walled-up remains crumble away the moment they are examined; that the growth of the tradition itself can be abundantly accounted for; that the few historians or antiquaries of repute, whether Catholic or Protestant, either avowedly disbelieve the calumny, or studiously refrain from repeating it" (*The Myths of the Walled-up Nuns*).

154. Did not Henry VIII dissolve the English monasteries because of their gross immorality?

No, this was merely a pretext for confiscating their properties. The chief accusers of the English monks—Layton, Leigh, Ap Rice and London—were men whom no one could believe under oath. As the *Athenæum* remarked in a critique of Gardner's *Letters and Papers* (November 27, 1836): "Seldom in the world's history has a tyrant found baser instruments for his basest designs than Henry found for carrying out the visitation of the English monasteries. That any monastery in England contained half a dozen such wretches as the more prominent visitors who came to despoil them is almost inconceivable."

155. How do you prove that Marriage is a Sacrament?

The Council of Trent (Sess. xix., can. 2) teaches that "Marriage is truly and properly a Sacrament of the law of the Gospel, and that it confers grace." While asserting that its sacramental character is proved chiefly by the divine tradition of the Fathers and the Councils, it declares that St. Paul "alludes" to it (innuit) in his letter to the Ephesians (v. 25-32).

St. Paul writes: "Love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. . . . So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great mystery (sacramentum), but I speak in Christ and the Church."

The three essentials of Sacrament are all expressed in these words of the Apostle: the marriage contract is an external sign, instituted by Christ to confer internal grace. Wilhelm-Scannell's *Manual of Theology* (ii., 512), thus states the argument: "The Apostle, speaking of Christian marriage, declares it to be a great sign of something sacred, namely, the union of Christ with His Church. Now, it is by sanctifying grace and by a continual influx of graces that this union takes place. A perfect representation of this union should contain something corresponding with the graces bestowed by Christ upon His Spouse—should likewise confer upon the parties grace connected with their state. Besides, the due fulfilment of the obligations imposed upon Christian spouses requires supernatural aid."

All the early Fathers insist upon the sanctity of marriage, and St. Augustine (354-430) calls it a Sacrament in many a passage. He writes: The excellence of marriage is threefold: faithfulness, offspring, the Sacrament. In faithfulness, it is required that neither should act in violation of the marriage tie; in the offspring, that they be received in love, fed with kindness, and educated religiously; and in the Sacrament, that the marriage be not dissolved, and that neither, if divorced, be united to another, not even for the sake of offspring" (*De Gen. ad Lit.*, ix., 7, 12).

156. Is polygamy allowed by the Gospel ?

While the original condition of marriage was monogamous, as Pope Nicholas (858-867) taught (*Ad Cons. Bulg.*), God granted a dispensation to the patriarchs, and tolerated the practice of polygamy (Deut. xxi. 15-17). The Gospel absolutely forbids polygamy, as we learn from the words of Christ and St. Paul (Matt. xix. 4-6; Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Eph. v. 23, 31). The Council of Trent condemned the Reformers who held "that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives, and that this is prohibited by no divine law" (Sess. xxiv., can. 2). The early Fathers are unanimous in condemning polygamy.

Luther, Melanchthon and Bucer wrote the Landgrave of Hesse that the divine law gave a general sanction to polygamy, and, acting on their advice, he took a second wife, Margaret von Sale. The Reformers urged him to keep this second marriage secret for fear of scandal, and because it clearly violated the Imperial law of the time. Bucer advised Philip, if any difficulty arose with the Emperor, to meet the problem by a downright lie (Grisar, *Luther*, iv., 13-70).

157. Why does the Catholic Church absolutely prohibit divorce ?

Our Lord's teaching that Christian marriage is indissoluble is clear. He said to the Pharisees who questioned Him about the lawfulness of divorce: "Have you not read that He who made man from the beginning made them male and female ? For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." When the Pharisees asked Him why then did Moses allow divorce, Christ answered that the Mosaic bill of divorce was contrary to the primitive law of indissolubility, and was granted only "by reason of the hardness of your heart" (Matt. xix. 4-8).

The same teaching may be found in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke. Christ says that the husband and wife who remarry after divorce both commit adultery, and a third party marrying the repudiated wife also commits adultery. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Mark x. 11, 12). "And he that marrieth her that is put away, committeth adultery" (Luke xvi. 18).

St. Paul compares Christian marriage to the indissoluble union of Christ with His Church (Eph. v. 24), and expressly states that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond. "For the woman that hath an husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law; but if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. Therefore, whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man; but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law of her husband, so that she is not an adulteress, if she be with another man" (Rom. vii, 2, 3). "To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband" (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11).

The words of Christ and St. Paul are most clear. They stigmatize the remarriage of either husband or wife with a third person as adultery (Matt. x. 11; Luke xvi. 18); they declare that if a just cause for separation exists, the parties must remain single or become reconciled (1 Cor. vii. 10); they assert that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond (Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 39.)

Separation from bed and board is permitted for weighty reasons, as the Council of Trent teaches (Sess. xxiv., can. 8). The Church would consider continual drunkenness or adultery weighty reasons.

The State is no guide in the matter of divorce, as St. John Chrysostom remarked over a thousand years ago. He writes: "Do not cite the civil law made by outsiders, which command that a bill be issued and a divorce granted. For it is not according to these laws that the Lord will judge thee on the Last Day, but according to those which He Himself has given" (*De Lib. Rep.*). The Church recognizes that the State can legislate with regard to the civil effects of marriage, *i. e.*, make laws fixing the dowry, the right of succession, alimony, etc., but she claims, as guardian of the Sacraments, the sole right of declaring whether a marriage is valid or not.

158. Did not Christ Himself allow divorce in case of adultery (Matt. v. 32 ; xix. 9) ?

Matt. v. 32 reads: "But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting for the case of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery."

"The Jews had interpreted the Mosaic ordinance in the sense that a man's duty towards his wife is fulfilled when he has given her a bill of divorce. He was then free to marry again. Our Lord says: No; a man's duty to his wife is not thereby fulfilled; he is responsible for the adultery which his wife may commit, if he dismisses her for any other reason than fornication. The phrase 'maketh her to commit adultery,' can only be understood on the supposition that the point at issue here is not the rights and liberties of the injured husband whose wife has committed adultery, but rather the responsibility which the husband who dismisses his wife contracts, in case she afterwards becomes an adulteress. She is not an adulteress before her dismissal, otherwise the phrase 'maketh her to commit adultery'—would have no meaning. And lest the bond of marriage should be thought to be dissolved when the wife is put away, our Lord lays it down that he who marries the woman that is put away commits adultery" (Mahon, *The Church and Divorce*, 22).

Matthew xix. 9 reads as follows: "And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery."

Christ is not allowing in this passage remarriage in case of adultery, as some non-Catholics have maintained, but is simply declaring that one has the right to separate from the adulterous partner. He had just restored marriage to its primitive perfection, emphasizing the fact that "what God had joined together no man can put asunder." If He had sanctioned divorce, He would have plainly contradicted what He had just said. It is a common rule of Biblical interpretation to judge a doubtful passage like this by the many clear texts which declare divorce absolutely forbidden (Mark x. 11, 12; Luke xvi. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 39).

The early Fathers are unanimous in teaching that adultery is never a ground for divorce.

159. Does not St. Paul permit divorce among Christians (1 Cor. vii. 12-15) ?

In this passage, St. Paul is not discussing Christian marriage, but the natural marriage of the unbaptized. He plainly teaches that a marriage between two unbaptized persons may be dissolved, if husband or wife is converted to the faith, while the unbaptized party refuses to live with the convert in peaceful wedlock. He says: "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband. . . . But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace."

This is known in canon law as the Pauline Privilege. Before it can be used, the convert must find out: 1. Whether the unbaptized partner is willing to receive Baptism, for in that case the marriage remains intact; 2. Whether the unbaptized party is willing to live in peaceful wedlock without blaspheming the Creator; *i. e.*, without intending to pervert or tempt the Christian to mortal sin (Pope Innocent III, 4 Decr., Tit. 19, ch. 7). If after due inquiry, technically called interpellation, these questions are answered in the negative, the Pauline Privilege may be used, and a new marriage contracted, which *ipso facto* dissolves the old. The laws governing this matter are found in canons 1120-1127 of the Code.

Although natural marriage is in itself indissoluble, it can be dissolved by God, who permitted divorce in the Old Law and the Pauline Privilege in the New.

160. Why does the Catholic Church arrogantly claim the sole control over Christian marriage ?

There is no arrogance in the Church's claim. While never

interfering with the State's right with regard to the civil consequences of marriage, the Catholic Church claims the entire control over Christian marriage because it is a Sacrament, and all the seven Sacraments have been divinely committed to her care. As the representative of Christ, she has the right to decide whether error, force or fraud has annulled a marriage contract; she has the right to limit the competency of certain parties to marry, *viz.*, those under age, those closely related, those in holy Orders; she has the right to safeguard her children from making unhappy marriages by her impediments of disparity of worship, of abduction and of crime.

The Council of Trent defined: "If anyone says that the Church cannot establish impediments dissolving Marriage, or that she has erred in establishing them, let him be anathema" (Sess. xxiv., can 4). Again: "If anyone says that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges, let him be anathema" (Canon 12).

161. Is it not true that while your Church *theoretically* prohibits divorce, she *practically* allows it by her system of annulments and dispensations?

It is not true. The Catholic Church never grants a dispensation from the divine or the natural law, but only from a law of her own making. She never, like the modern State, declares a valid marriage null and void, but asserts by her annulment that a so-called marriage never actually took place. Is there no difference between tearing up a genuine fifty-dollar bill (The State divorce) and declaring another fifty-dollar bill a counterfeit (The Church annulment)?

Controversialists often accuse the Roman Rota of giving forth annulments with a lavish hand. Do they realize that in five years, this court which legislates for the whole world granted only ninety-eight decrees of nullity and refused fifty? The United States alone grants about one hundred and fifty thousand divorces a year.

162. Why is your Church so bitterly opposed to mixed marriages?

The Catholic Church has prohibited mixed marriages from the earliest times, as we learn from the laws passed by the Councils of Elvira (300), Laodicea (343-389), Hippo (393) and Chalcedon (451). In modern times we find them strongly condemned by Popes Urban VIII, Clement XI, Benedict XIV, Pius IX and Leo XIII.

The chief reason for the prohibition is the danger of loss of faith on the part of the Catholic party and the children born of the marriage. Frequently a bitter unbeliever or a bigoted Protestant manifests his hatred of the Church after marriage, and by ridicule, bad example, and actual presence of various kinds, occasions the apostasy of a weak-minded, ill-instructed or careless consort. The Catholic Church loses thousands of members annually by mixed marriages. If the danger of perversion is proximate, such marriages are forbidden even by the divine law (Canon 1066).

The children of such marriages are often lost to the faith. The influence of an unbelieving non-church going parent, especially a mother, in the open questioning of all things Catholic, will naturally prove a hindrance to the children's faith and devotion, unless it is strongly counteracted by the Catholic parent, the Catholic school, and the Church. Frequently, too, the Catholic parent dies, and the non-Catholic survives, bringing up the children in an alien faith.

The different religious beliefs of the parents often causes discord in the home, especially when the non-Catholic is dominated by bitter, prejudiced relatives. Serious trouble too may arise from the divergent moral views on such important matters as divorce, family limitation, and the vital necessity of Catholic education for the children.

The Catholic Church never grants a dispensation unless for just and grave reasons. The non-Catholic party need not be baptized, but he must give guarantees (*cautiones*) in writing that the danger of the Catholic party's perversion will be removed. Both parties also must promise that all the children will be baptized and brought up Catholics (Canon 1061). The Church has no option in this case, for she is bound by the divine law to do all in her power to prevent her children losing the faith. The very fact that non-Catholics sign these promises so readily proves that their faith is not very sound, but merely a matter of opinion. They are for the most part indifferentists.

The canon law (Canon 1063) expressly forbids a Catholic to give or renew his matrimonial consent before a non-Catholic minister. Catholics doing so by the very fact incur excommunication, for such action is an open profession of heresy or schism. In countries that insist upon their citizens going through the formality of a civil marriage, a Catholic is bound to obey the law to insure their civil privileges. The civil marriage is then to be regarded merely as a legal formality; it has no religious significance whatever.

163. Why is the Catholic Church so bitterly opposed to birth control?

The Catholic Church condemns birth control as an unnatural and immoral vice, prohibited by the Fifth and the Sixth Commandments. While there has been no ruling upon this matter by any General Council, the Church's divine tradition from the days of the primitive Church to the latest decrees of the Roman Congregations has always been clear and unequivocal. A decree of the Holy Office, March 21, 1851, declared it forbidden by the natural law, and a second decree, April 10, 1853, declared it intrinsically evil. No standard book of Catholic ethics or moral theology ever tolerated the practice.

The marital right is not only lawful and holy, but a strict right, binding upon both parties until death, and voidable only for good reasons, such as drunkenness, insanity, grave dangers to life and health and the like. By mutual consent, however, both husband and wife may forego their rights, either permanently or for a time (1 Cor. vii. 5).

Non-Catholics frequently misunderstand our position on birth control, for they seem to believe that Catholic married couples are bound to have children to the utmost capacity of the mother for child-bearing. This is not true. It is perfectly ethical to limit the family, if the method is self-control by abstinence and continence. What the Catholic Church absolutely forbids is the limitation of the family, or contraception, by chemical, mechanical or other artificial means.

Birth control is against the law of nature. It is unnatural inasmuch as it implies the frustration of the order of creation. It defeats the immediate end of a natural human act; it is against the natural instincts of humanity; it leads to excess in the use of a function, which pre-eminently calls for the exercise of self-control.

The immediate purpose and primary end of Marriage is the begetting of children. When the marital relation is so used as to render the fulfilment of its purpose impossible, it is used unethically and unnaturally. The pleasures of marriage are innocent in view of legitimate child-bearing; they become sinful and degrading, only when separated from the sacrifices and responsibilities of parenthood.

There is no evidence whatever to prove the so-called fact of overpopulation. Indeed, the latest scientific studies prove the contrary. Although the world's population in recent decades has been rapidly increasing, the food production of the world has been increasing at a still more rapid rate.

The poverty plea is easily ruled out of court, because, as a matter of fact, the poor do not practice birth control as much as the well-to-do. It is not the high rents, the cost of child-bearing, or the expenses of child-rearing that fosters contraception; it is the immorality and irreligion of the modern parent, who is eaten up with selfishness and the love of pleasure.

It is often asserted that the mother who bears many children pays the penalty in loss of health and life. We willingly grant that child-bearing is always attended with some risk despite the fact that modern scientific progress in obstetrics has eliminated the danger in great part. But on the other hand we have statistics to prove that maternal longevity is associated with large families. While these figures do not prove that maternal longevity is the result of prolific child-bearing, they do prove that the slim statistics of the advocates of birth control are utterly worthless. Not the bearing of children, but poverty, ignorance, and the lack of medical care are in most cases the real causes of disease and death.

Birth control is often advocated as beneficial to men and women, but many reputable physicians have made a large list of diseases traceable to this pagan interference with the laws of nature: sterility, fibroids, neuroses of various kinds.

Birth control is often destructive of the peace, happiness and stability of the marriage bond. The rearing of a good-sized family cements the love of husband and wife by its many demands upon their better nature. More divorces occur when marriages are childless (Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, iii., 366).

A large family is an inestimable boon to the children thereof, teaching them self-reliance, generosity, self-discipline, and self-mastery. The one child of the modern home is likely to be a selfish and useless member of society.

X. SACRAMENTALS

164. What is the difference between a Sacrament and a sacramental?

The seven Sacraments were all instituted by Christ, and the Church is powerless to change them; when worthily received, they infallibly confer grace of themselves. The sacramentals are rites instituted by the Church, which can modify or abrogate them at will; they do not confer sanctifying grace of themselves, but depend for their efficacy upon the personal devotion

of the faithful using them, and the intention of the Church, manifested by her official prayers.

The sacramentals may move God to give special actual graces, for the leading of a good Christian life in the married state or the clerical; *v. g.*, the nuptial blessing; the tonsure; they may protect the soul from Satan, and drive away evil spirits; *v. g.*, exorcism, holy water; they may dedicate a thing to the service of God; *v. g.*, the blessing of a church, an altar, a chalice; they may forgive venial sins by inclining the soul to penance; *v. g.*, the recital of the Lord's Prayer, the Confiteor, the sign of the Cross; they may, if it be God's will, obtain temporal favours; *v. g.*, the blessing of a private home, of the harvest.

165. Why do Catholics sprinkle themselves with holy water before entering church?

Catholics use holy water to drive away evil spirits, and to call to mind the purity of heart with which they should come into the presence of Christ, really present upon the altar. In blessing it, the priest adds some salt to symbolize incorruption and immortality. The use of holy water is in no way a superstitious practice, because Catholics do not believe that it has any virtue in itself; its efficacy depends entirely upon the devotion of those who use it, and upon God's acceptance of the prayers of His Church.

The Jews used holy water extensively in their ritual; *v. g.*, in the ordination of priests and levites (Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. 6; Num. viii. 7), before offering sacrifice (Exod. xxx. 17), in the accusation of adultery (Num. v. 17), and in the ablutions before meals and prayers (Mark vii. 13). A brazen laver for ablutions was specially blessed (Lev. viii. 11) and placed between the altar and the tabernacle (Exod. xxx. 18; xxxviii. 8; xl. 7). There were ten lavers in Solomon's Temple (3 Kings, vii. 38).

The blessing of holy water with a prayer to drive away evil spirits is found in many ancient documents of the Church. Thus in the fourth century we find it in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Testament of the Lord*, and the *Pontifical of Serapion*.

166. Is it not superstitious to wear the scapular?

Catholics do not consider the scapular a charm against evil. The small scapular of woollen cloth, or the medal which may take its place since 1910, is merely a badge of membership in a religious confraternity, associated with some religious order, like the Carmelites, the Servites, the Trinitarians, the Passionists or the Dominicans. It is modelled on the monastic scapular, which was worn over the cassock.

The faithful who wear it share in the great merits of the sister, gain special indulgences, and pledge themselves to be devout clients of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints.

XI. THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, SAVIOUR

167. Why do you call the Virgin Mary the Mother of God?

Because the Sacred Scriptures plainly declare in many passages that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God. The angel Gabriel said to Mary: "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son and thou shalt call His name Jesus. . . . The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And, therefore, also the Holy that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 21, 26). The saintly Elizabeth greeted Mary with the words: "Whence is this to me that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" (Luke i. 42.) St. Paul says that "God sent His Son, made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4; Cf. Rom. i. 3).

The Apostles' Creed professes: "And in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." This belief was so firmly accepted as divinely revealed, that the Council of Ephesus in 451 made it the standard of orthodoxy, excommunicating the Nestorian heretics who denied it.

Non-Catholics who make Mary the Mother of Jesus do so, because they do not accept the true doctrine of the Incarnation, viz., that Jesus Christ possesses a Divine and a Human nature in one Divine Personality. Jesus was never a human person; He was a divine Person who assumed our human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary. She was the mother of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and therefore the Mother of God.

As our mothers are not called the mothers of our bodies, but simply our mothers, because the soul directly created by God is united with the body in a human personality, so the Blessed Virgin is not called the mother of the Human Nature of Christ, but simply the Mother of God, because the Divine Nature, Eternally Begotten of God the Father, is united with the Human Nature in the Divine Personality of Jesus Christ.

Many Protestants do not know that both Luther and Calvin admitted the dogma of the divine maternity. Luther writes: "There is no honour, no beatitude, capable of approaching an elevation which consists in being, of the whole human race, the sole

person, superior to all others, unequalled in the prerogative of having one Son in common with the Heavenly Father" (*Deutsche Schriften*, xiv., 250). Calvin writes: "We cannot acknowledge the blessings brought us by Jesus without acknowledging at the same time how highly God honoured and enriched Mary in choosing her for the Mother of God" (*Comm. sur l' Harm., Evang.*, 20).

168. How can you claim that Mary was always a virgin, when the Scriptures often speak of brethren of Jesus?

The dogma of the Virgin Birth was defined as an article of faith by the Fifth General Council held at Constantinople under Pope Vigilius in 553, and again by the Lateran Council held by Pope Martin I at Rome in 640. It is a dogma held unanimously by the Fathers of the Church from the very beginning, and taught explicitly in both the Old Testament and the New.

The prophet Isaias foretold the birth of Jesus Christ from a Virgin Mother. He says: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and His name shall be called Emmanuel" (Isa. vii. 14). The word he uses for virgin, *almah*, is always equivalent to virgin in the Old Testament (Gen. xxiv. 43; Exod. ii. 4; Canticles i. 2; vi. 7; Ps. lxxvii. 26; Prov. xxx. 19). The Jews in their Septuagint version of the Old Testament (286-246 B.C.) translated *almah* by *parthenos*, the Greek equivalent for an inviolate virgin.

The New Testament teaches the Virgin Birth in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost" (Matt i. 20). "The angel was sent from God to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph" (Luke i. 26, 27).

The Fathers of the first four centuries all teach the Virgin Birth: St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, xxxi., 46; *Dial. cum Tryp.*, 85); Aristides (*Apol.*); St. Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.*, v., 16); Origen (*Hom.*, vii., *In Lucam*); St. Hilary (*In Matt.*, i., 3), St. Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.*, lxxviii, 1-7; St. Jerome (*Adv. Helv.*).

The Fathers give four reasons why the brethren of Jesus were not Mary's children. 1. They argue that her virginity was implied by her answer to the angel: "How shall this be done, because I know not man" (Luke i. 34); 2. If Mary had other children, why is Jesus so emphatically called "the Son of Mary?" (Mark vi. 3), and why is Mary never called the mother of the brethren of the Lord?; 3. The Gospel texts all imply that the brethren were older than Jesus. They were jealous of His popu-

larity; they criticized Him and gave Him advice; they endeavoured to lay hold on Him on the supposition that He was mad (Mark vi. 4; John vii. 1; Mark iii. 31); 4. If Mary had other children, why should Jesus, dying on the Cross, have intrusted His Mother to the care of St. John? (John xix. 26, 27).

We shall never know to a certainty the exact relationship of the four brothers, James, Joseph, Simon and Jude. It will always remain doubtful whether "Mary of Clopas" (Cleophas) was the wife of Clopas or his sister. In either case her children, James and Joseph, were cousins of Jesus, either on the mother's or the father's side. It will always remain doubtful whether James, the brother of the Lord, is James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus; and again, whether his father Alphæus is the same as Clopas (Alphæus-Clopas), the brother of St. Joseph. If both hypotheses are true, and we think they are, then Jude was a cousin of Jesus on both his mother's and his father's side.

The word "brother" in itself proves nothing, for it had a very wide meaning among the Jews. It is used in the Old Testament for relatives in general (Job xlii. 2; xix. 13, 14), nephews (Gen. xiii. 18; xxiv. 14; xxix. 15), distant cousins (Lev. x. 4), and first cousins (1 Par. xxiii. 21, 22). Besides there was no word in Hebrew or Aramaic for cousin, so that the Old Testament writers were forced to use the word *AH*, brother, to describe different degrees of kindred.

169. Was not your dogma of the Virgin Birth taken over from paganism ?

The ancient pagan myths are taken from nature, representing the succession of day and night, or of the seasons, and the mystery of life and its transmission from one creature to another. They are undated, and unlocated, and generally belong to a vaguely imagined period before the coming of man. But the account of our Lord's birth has the form, not of myth, but of history; place, date and contemporary persons and events are specified, and it is interwoven not only with the texture of general history, but also with the events of our Lord's life in such a way as to be inseparable from the Gospel account of them. As Martindale says: "Conscious adaptation of myth by the Gospel writers is a grotesque supposition, neglected by reputable scholarship; there was no time for an unconscious deformation of historical events in view of the early date now generally admitted for the composition of the Gospels" (*The Virgin Birth*, 30).

170. Do not the words "before they came together" and "till she brought forth her first born Son" prove

that the Marriage of Mary and Joseph was really consummated later on (Matt. i. 18 ; Luke ii. 7) ?

They prove nothing of the kind. These texts, which were adduced against the Virgin birth by Helvidius in the fourth century, were ably answered by St. Jerome. In reply he cited many passages from the Scriptures to prove that the words *before* and *till* did not imply the subsequent occurrence of the things in question. "Noe opening the window of the ark, sent forth a raven, which went forth, and did not return *till* the waters were dried up upon the earth" (Gen. viii. 6, 7)—*i. e.*, the raven never returned. Or again: "And no man hath known of his sepulchre *until* the present day" (Deut. xxxiv. 6)—*i. e.*, no one ever discovered where Moses had been buried.

171. Do not the words : "She brought forth her first born Son" imply that Mary had at least two children (Matt. i. 25) ?

Not at all. The Mosaic law of the first born (Exod. xxxiv. 19, 20) held as soon as the mother had given birth to a son, whether he was the only one, or whether he was succeeded by other children. The Jews frequently spoke of a mother dying, when bringing forth her first born son.

172. Does not your doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin contradict the Scriptures, which teach that all men died in Adam (1 Cor. xv. 22 ; Cf. Rom. v. 12) ?

The doctrine means that at the very first instant when her soul was infused into her body, the Virgin Mary was sanctified by God's grace, so that her soul was never deprived of the sanctification, which all other creatures had forfeited by the sin of Adam. Her soul was never displeasing to God, because it had never been stained with original sin.

On December 8, 1854, Pope Pius IX defined that "the doctrine which declares that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, was preserved exempt from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God, and therefore must be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful" (*Ineffabilis Deus*).

Rationalists and Broadchurchmen deny this dogma because they deny the existence of Original Sin, while orthodox Protestants deny it, because of their erroneous notion of Original

Sin. Cardinal Newman writes: "Our doctrine of Original Sin is not the same as the Protestant doctrine. Original sin with us cannot be called sin, in the more ordinary sense of the word; it is a term denoting Adam's sin as transferred to us, or the state to which Adam's sin reduces his children; but by Protestants it seems to be understood as sin, in much the same sense as actual sin."

We, with the Fathers, think of it as something negative, Protestants as something positive. Protestants hold that it is a disease, a radical change of nature, an active poison actively corrupting the soul, infecting its primary elements, and disorganizing it; and they deny we ascribe a different nature from ours to the Blessed Virgin, different from that of her parents, and from that of fallen Adam.

We consider that in Adam she died as others; that she was included, together with the whole race in Adam's sentence; that she incurred the debt as we do; but that for the sake of Him who was to redeem her and as upon the Cross, to her the debt was remitted by anticipation; on her the sentence was not carried out, except indeed as regards her natural death, for she died when her time came, as others.

All this we teach, but we deny that she had Original Sin; for by Original sin we mean, as I have already said, something negative, namely, this only, the deprivation of that supernatural unmerited grace with Adam and Eve had on their first formation—deprivation and the consequence of deprivation.

Mary could not merit any more than they, the restoration of that grace; but it was restored to her by God's free bounty from and at the very first moment of her existence, and thereby, in fact, she never came under the original curse, which consisted in the loss of it." (*Difficulties of Anglicans* ii., 48, 49).

The Scriptures nowhere expressly teach this doctrine, but Pius IX. cites two passages, from which it may be inferred, if they are considered in the light of Catholic tradition. They are: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed; she shall crush thy head and thou shalt lie in wait of her heel" (Gen. iii. 15). "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women" (Luke i. 28). Christ and His Mother are both spoken of as enemies of Satan and of sin; He, absolutely sinless as the son of God, and she sinless, or full of grace, by God's special prerogative and gift.

The Blessed Virgin holds a unique position of dignity and pre-eminence in the writings of the early Fathers, many of whose statements would be exaggerated or untrue, had she been any

ceived in Original Sin. They imply her freedom from all sin by their insistence upon her perfect purity, and her position as the second Eve.

173. Why do Catholics claim that the Virgin Mary never committed sin, when the Bible says: "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8) ?

Catholics believe that the Blessed Virgin was free from all actual sin because of divine tradition confirmed by the Council of Trent. St. Augustine writes: "Except, therefore, the Holy Virgin Mary, about whom, on account of the honour of our Lord, I will not allow the question to be entertained, when sins are under discussion—for how do we know what increase of grace was bestowed on her, to enable her to overcome sin in every way" (*De Natura et Gratia*, 36).

The Council of Trent defines: "If anyone says that man once justified can during his whole life avoid all sins, even venial ones, as the Church holds that the Blessed Virgin did by special privilege of God, let him be anathema" (Sess. vi., can. 23).

174. Is there any Biblical or historical proof of the ascension of the Virgin Mary into heaven ?

The dogma of the Assumption means the Blessed Virgin's entrance into heaven, body and soul, by the power of God. The active term Ascension is used only of Jesus Christ's entrance into heaven by his own divine power. The doctrine has never been defined by the Church, although its wide acceptance since the sixth century renders it a certain doctrine, that cannot be denied by Catholics without rashness.

It cannot be proved from the Bible, or from contemporary historical witnesses, but it rests on such solid theological principles, that many Bishops have written the Apostolic See, requesting its definition as a dogma of the faith.

"A doctrine," says Renaudin, "universally held for over thirteen hundred years, could only have originated in a special revelation of our Lord to his Apostles" (*La Doctrine de l'Assumption*).

175. Do Catholics adore the Virgin Mary?

No, Catholics adore God alone, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. They love and reverence the Blessed Virgin, because God honoured her above all creatures by choosing her to be the mother of His only Son. St. Epiphanius in the fourth century con-

demned the Collyridians, the only sect in history, who gave her divine honours, saying: "We do not adore the saints. . . . Let Mary then be honoured, but the Father, Son and Holy Ghost alone be adored" (*Adv. Collyrid.*, 29).

176. Why do Catholics pay so much honour to Mary, when she was only an ordinary woman?

The Catholic Church has always paid special honour to the Blessed Virgin, because God honoured her above all creatures by bestowing upon her the highest dignity He could confer—the divine maternity. The Scriptures tell us that Jesus honoured her by dwelling with her under the same roof at Nazareth for thirty years until He began His public ministry, and that he showed His love to her on the Cross, when He left her to the kindly care of His beloved disciple, St. John (John xix. 26). I could never understand how intelligent men hoped to extol the Son of God by making little of the Mother of God. We do not win the affections of our fellowmen by despising or making little of their mothers.

How can you call Mary an ordinary woman, and at the same time pretend that you have studied the Scriptures? Would God choose an ordinary woman to be the Mother of His only Son, when he had countless millions of women to choose from? The prophet Isaias spoke of her coming centuries before (vii. 14), and God sent from heaven a special ambassador to announce her super-eminent dignity (Luke i. 26), and another to comfort St. Joseph in his doubting (Matt. i. 20). Both the angel and St. Elizabeth called her "blessed among women" (Luke i. 28, 43), and her own prophecy that "henceforth all generations shall call me blessed" (Luke i. 48) is fulfilled to the letter every day by Catholics the world over.

Instead of detracting from the love of Christ, devotion to Mary increases our love for Him. The devout client of Mary is ever the strong defender of the divinity of Jesus Christ, her Son. The divine maternity, as the Council of Ephesus clearly recognized in 431, has ever been the standard of orthodox belief in the true doctrine of the Incarnation.

Love for Mary, the masterpiece of God's creation, by its very nature leads us to the love of Christ her Son. He cannot be jealous of the praise we give her, for every one of her privileges and prerogatives are His own free gift. Is the artist jealous of the praise you give his masterpiece? Is the author jealous of the praise you give his book?

177. Did not Christ speak harshly to the Virgin,

saying to her at the marriage of Cana : "Woman, what have I to do with thee" (John ii. 4) ?

The Catholic version is more accurate : "What (is it) to me and to thee ?" According to Father Lagrange the Arabs of Palestine still use this same expression : "What to thee ?" It has a two-fold meaning, either "attend to your own affairs," or when said smilingly, "Do not worry, all will turn out well." This second meaning is certainly the meaning here, for Christ immediately works the miracle of changing water into wine at His Mother's request.

The use of the word "woman" does not in the slightest degree imply any disrespect, or even emphasize, as some have falsely held, the infinite distinction between Mary, the creature, and her divine Son. It is simply a solemn mode of addressing anyone, as we know from our Lord's use of it on the Cross (John xix. 26).

Many Protestant commentators—Westcott, Bloomfield, Ellicott, Alford, Trench—admit that our Lord did not speak harshly to His mother in this passage. Trench writes : "It is true that in the address 'woman' there is nothing of severity or harshness, however much it may have some such sound to English ears. In those last and tenderest words which our lord addressed to His Mother, He used the same language : 'Woman, behold thy Son.' So far from any harshness, the compellation has something solemn in it, and cannot but have such where the dignity of woman is truly felt. But it is otherwise with the words : 'What have I to do with thee ?' . . . Any severity which these words may seem to have in reading, we cannot doubt was mitigated in the manner of speaking ; suffering, as it did, a near compliance with her request to look as though an apparent refusal" (*On Miracles*, Ser. 1).

178. Did not Christ disown His Mother, when He said, "My Mother and My brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it" (Luke viii. 21; Cf. Matt. xii. 46, 50) ?

Not at all. He is simply taking occasion of the presence of His Mother and cousins to teach the people the necessity of keeping the word of God, as Mary did (Luke i. 38, 45 ; ii. 19, 51), and the necessity of detachment from even one's kinsfolk for the love of God. Tertullian writes : "Christ is wont to do everything that He enjoins upon others. How strange then would it certainly have been if, while He was teaching others

not to esteem mother or father or brother as highly as the word of God, He were Himself to leave the word of God as soon as His Mother and brethren were announced to Him. He denied His parents, therefore, in the same sense in which He has taught us to deny ours—for God's sake" (*De Carne Christi*, 7).

179. What is the origin and meaning of the Rosary?

The chief object of the Rosary devotion is meditation upon the mysteries of our Redemption. The fifteen mysteries—the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, the Presentation, the Finding in the Temple, the Agony, the Scourging, the Crowning with Thorns, the Carrying of the Cross, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Spirit, the Assumption and the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin—are an excellent summary of the Gospel. Catholics try to realize them clearly and to feel them deeply, while they recite fifteen decades or tens of Hail Marys with an Our Father between each one.

From the ninth to the twelfth century the priests of the monastic orders said Masses for their deceased brethren, while the uneducated lay brothers recited fifty Psalms or fifty Our Fathers. The recitation of fifty Hail Marys, divided in sets of ten, is first mentioned in the *Anceren Riwele* of the English anchoresses of the twelfth century. The counting of these prayers on strings of beads to prevent distraction soon became prevalent, and two hundred years later the practice of meditation on the mysteries was introduced by a Carthusian named Dominic.

180. Why do Catholics pray to the Virgin and the Saints?

The Church's teaching on the invocation of the saints is thus defined by the Council of Trent. "The saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men. It is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son Jesus Christ, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour. Those persons think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; who assert that they do not pray for men; who declare that asking them to pray for each of us in particular is idolatry, repugnant to the word of God, and opposed to the honour of the *One Mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus*" (Sess. xxv.).

The Old and New Testament plainly teach the principle and the practice of asking the prayers of our brethren, especially of the just (James v. 16-18). God commanded Abimelech to ask Abraham's prayers: "He shall pray for thee and thou shalt live" (Gen. xx. 7, 17). God had mercy on the sinful children of Israel in the desert because Moses interceded for them (Ps. xv. 23). God said to the friends of Job: "My servant Job shall pray for you; his face I will accept" (Job xlii. 8). St. Paul in his letters continually asked the brethren to pray for him (Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18, 19; 1 Thess. v. 25).

Is it reasonable to suppose that the Christian, who prayed for his brethren while upon earth, will lose all interest in them once he reaches the kingdom of heaven? The Christian tradition from the beginning declares that the interest of the Saints in heaven will be increased a hundredfold, because they will realize then more fully our needs and necessities, and God's willingness to hearken to their intercession. St. Jerome (340-420) is a striking witness to this fact. He writes: "If Apostles and martyrs, whilst still in the flesh and still needing to care for themselves, can pray for others, how much more will they pray for others after they have won their crowns, their victories, their triumphs. Moses, one man, obtains God's pardon for six hundred thousand armed men, and Stephen prays for his persecutors. When they are with Christ will they be less powerful? St. Paul says that two hundred and seventy-six souls were granted to his prayers, whilst they were in the ship with him. Shall he close his lips after death, and not mutter a syllable for those who throughout the world have believed in his gospel?" (*Adv. Vigil.*, 6.)

That the angels pray for men we learn from the vision of Zacharias (i. 12, 13), and from the words of the angel Raphael to Tobias: "When thou didst pray with tears... I offered thy prayer to the Lord" (Tob. xii. 12). Christ Himself tells us that they have an interest in us, for He says: "There shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance" (Luke xv. 10). In another place He warns men not to scandalize little children, for they have angels to intercede for them in heaven (Matt. xviii. 10).

The early Fathers unanimously teach the doctrine of the intercession of the saints.

181. Why do Catholics adore images and pray to them?

Catholics do not adore images or pray to them. The Council

of Trent says: "The images of Christ and the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and to be kept especially in churches, and due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that merit is to be repaid in images, as was done of old by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which these images represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ, and we venerate the saints whose likeness they bear" (Sess. xxv.). This merely repeats the teaching of the Second Council of Nice in 787, which condemned the Eastern Iconoclasts, who held that reverence paid to images was a work of the devil and a new form of idolatry.

Even if we grant that God forbade the making of all images to the Jews, such a law would not bind Christians, as the positive Jewish law was abrogated by the Gospel (Rom. vii. 1, 2; Gal. iii. 23-25). There is certainly no inherent wickedness in making a graven image. The eternal law can never be abrogated; it will always be sinful "to adore them and serve them." We know that the Jews did not understand the command as an absolute prohibition of images, for we find a number of them in the Temple. There were, for example, the brazen serpent (Num. xxi. 9), the golden cherubim (Exod. xxv. 18; Levitic. i. 24; 1 Kings vi. 23), the carved garlands of flowers, fruit and trees (Num. vii. 4; 1 Kings vi. 18; vii. 36), the carved lions which supported the basins and the King's throne (1 Kings vii. 24; 1 Kings vii. 20), and the ephod (Judges vii. 27; 1 Kings xxi. 13).

The early Christians adorned their Catacombs with many frescoes of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which recalled incidents in the Sacred Scriptures. The most common paintings were Moses striking the rock, Noe in the ark, Daniel in the lion's den, the Nativity, the coming of the Wise Men, the marriage feast of Cana, the raising of Lazarus, and Christ the Good Shepherd. Statues were rare only because they were costly and difficult to make. When the Church came up from the catacombs, she began to decorate her churches with costly mosaics, carvings, paintings and statues. No one can honestly accuse these early Christians of idolatry, for they died in protest against it by the thousands, and wrote treatise after treatise condemning it.

182. Is it not superstitious to venerate the relics of the saints ?

The Council of Trent teaches "that the holy bodies of holy martyrs and others now living with Christ—which bodies were the living members of Christ and the temples of the Holy Ghost—and which are by Him to be raised to eternal life and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; for through these bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on men, so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints, or that these and other sacred monuments are uselessly honoured by the faithful, and that the places dedicated to the memory of the saints are in vain visited with the view of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned" (Sess. xxv.).

The Catholic Church does not teach that there is any magical virtue or any curative efficacy in the relic itself. The Church merely says, following the Scriptures, that they are often the occasion of God's miracles. In the Old Law we read of the veneration of the Jews for the bones of Joseph (Exod. xiii. 19; Jos. xxiv. 32), and of the prophet Eliseus which raised a dead man to life (4 Kings xiii. 21; Cf. Eccles. xlvi. 12); in the New, of the woman cured by touching the hem of our Lord's garment (Matt. ix. 20, 21), of the sick healed by the shadow of St. Peter (Acts v. 15, 16), and of the handkerchiefs and aprons that had touched the body of St. Paul (Acts xix. 12).

The veneration of the relics of the saints can be traced as far back as the second century. After St. Polycarp had been burned at the stake, his disciples, "took up his bones, which were more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place, where the Lord allows us to assemble in gladness and joy to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom" (*Mart. Poly.*). Many of the early Fathers, while strongly repudiating the charge of idolatry or "cinder-worshipping," extol highly the cultus of relics, among them St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. John Chrysostom. St. Jerome (340-420) writes: "We do not worship, we do not adore, we do not bow down before the creature rather than to the Creator, but we venerate the relics of the martyrs in order the better to adore Him whose martyrs they are" (*Ad Riparium*, ix.).

The same spirit that prompts a mother to treasure carefully a lock of her dead baby's hair; the same spirit that prompts

Americans to treasure the pen of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, the Liberty Bell, or the sword of Washington, has ever prompted the Christian people to venerate whatever belonged to the saints of God.

The Catholic Church has never declared that any particular relic is authentic, but she takes the greatest pains to see that no public honour is paid to any relic, unless she is reasonably convinced of its genuine character. It matters little if the relic be not authentic, for the reverence we pay is to the saint. Since the World War, the nations of the world have erected monuments to the Unknown Soldier, in order to foster the spirit of patriotism. The particular soldier thus honoured may have been a coward in war time, or an unworthy scoundrel. The honours we pay are given to the soldiers who died for their country.

183. What historical proof is there that the Cross on which the Saviour died was really discovered by St. Helena?

Whether St. Helena herself discovered the True Cross may be questioned, but the fact that it was found in the early part of the fourth century (327) is attested by many a writer of the period.

Rohault de Fleury in 1870, after a careful study of all the relics of the True Cross in existence, found that altogether they would make two-fifths of a cubic foot of an estimated Cross of six and five-eighths cubic feet of timber.

184. Must Catholics believe all the miracles recorded in the lives of the saints?

Miracles did not end with the Apostles. Christ himself promised that miracles would always be a mark of His true Church, and a gift He would always bestow upon His faithful followers, the saints (Mark xvi. 18; John xiv. 12). No unprejudiced man can read the testimony of the miracles of the saints canonized by the Apostolic See, and study the strict rules laid down by Pope Benedict XIV for the Church's guidance, without being convinced of their authenticity. Indeed evidence, which outsiders have considered convincing, has, as a matter of fact, been rejected by the Congregation of Rites at Rome as untrustworthy. The miracles wrought at Lourdes through the intercession of our Lady are always put to the severest tests of scientific scrutiny. The evidence may be read in the works of Bertrin, Boissarie, Marchand and others. Cf. Question 25 above.

Miracles are historical facts, and, therefore, are always to be

weighed according to the rules of historical evidence. Catholics are not bound to accept the pseudo-miracles of the medieval chroniclers, or of modern pious sentimentalists, but they strenuously protest against that modern rationalistic prejudice, which refuses to consider any evidence for their happening, because of a false presupposition of their impossibility.

185. Since God is everywhere, why do Catholics make pilgrimages to various shrines?

Catholics are well aware that God is everywhere, and that we can pray to Him in every place. "The gates of heaven are equally open to the citizens of Jerusalem or of Britain," as St. Jerome once said. But since Jesus Christ dignified the Holy Land by making it His dwelling place while upon earth, Christians from the very beginning have always desired to visit the cities hallowed by His presence. The same feeling prompts them to visit the shrines of the Blessed Virgin, the martyrs and the saints. It is certain that God has granted many favours, temporal and spiritual, to His people at these shrines, and visiting them has caused Catholics to pray with greater fervour, to do more penance for their sins, and to receive Communion more frequently.

The Bible tells of Elcana and Anna going every year to pray at Silo (1 Kings i. 3), and of our Lord Himself taking part in the annual Jewish pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Luke ii. 41).

Besides fostering the devotion of the people, pilgrimages had many another good effect. They contributed to the growth of many a medieval city; they caused many a good road to be built; they increased communication between foreign countries; they gave rise to medieval miracle plays; they gave stay-at-homes a knowledge of the geography of other lands; they brought into being religious orders like the Knights of St. John and the Knight Templars; they kept Europe from becoming Mohammedan through the Crusades.

XII. LIFE AFTER DEATH

186. How do you prove from the Bible that there is a Judgment immediately after death? If there is, what need is there of a General Judgment?

Death, according to Catholic teaching, is universal (Jos. xxiii. 14; 3 Kings ii. 2; Heb. ix. 27); it is a punishment due to Adam's sin (Gen. ii. 17; iii. 19; Rom. v. 13; vi. 25; 1 Cor. xv.

21, 22); it ends the state of probation, concluding in the hour after the possibility of further merit or demerit (Mark ii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 42; xxv. 13; John xiv. 19; 2 Cor. v. 10).

The Particular Judgment, although never expressly mentioned in the Bible, is clearly implied in the passages which speak of an immediate retribution after death. Christ taught that Simon and Lazarus were punished immediately after death (Luke xvi. 26), and He promised the penitent thief the happiness of Paradise at once (Luke xxiii. 43). St. Paul also speaks of heaven as the immediate reward of the blessed (2 Cor. v. 6-8; Cf. Phil. i. 23).

St. Augustine (A.D. 430) writes: "Souls are judged when they depart from the body, before they come to that Judgment (The General Judgment) which must be passed on them when reunited to the body, and are tormented or glorified in that same state which they have inhabited" (*De Anima et ejus Origine*, ii., 5).

Pope Benedict XII in 1336 defined in his Bull *Benedictus Deus* that "the souls of those who depart this life in the state of mortal sin descend into hell immediately after death, and are there subject to infernal torments" and those who die in the state of sanctifying grace "behold the Divine Presence intuitively and face to face." This was also the teaching of the Council of Florence in 1439.

The General Judgment is contained as an article of faith in all the ancient Creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian. The prophets of the Old Law call it the "Day of the Lord" (Joel ii. 31; Ezech. xiii. 5; Isa. ii. 12). Our Lord describes it in minute detail (Matt. xxiv. 27; xxv. 31), and His Apostles mention it most frequently (Acts i. 11; xiii. 31; Rom. ii. 5-16; xiv. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Thess. i. 5; James v. 7).

The purpose of the General Judgment is to manifest before the whole human race the Mercy and Justice of God. It will embrace all our works and sins, even our idle words and most secret thoughts (Matt. xii. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 5). The chief events that will precede it are the universal preaching of the Gospel (Matt. xxiv. 14), the conversion of many Jews (Rom. xi. 25), the great apostasy and the coming of Antichrist (2 Thess. ii. 3), and many extraordinary disturbances of nature (Matt. xxiv. 29; 2 Peter iii. 10).

187. Is not the dogma of the Resurrection of the Body unreasonable?

The Resurrection of the Body, while eminently reasonable, is a miraculous event, due solely to the Omnipotence of God. Human

reason of itself could never know it with certainty; we believe it firmly, because the Catholic Church, the infallible teacher of divine revelation, in the name of the Bible and tradition, has declared it an article of faith in her Creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene and the Athanasian—and in her Councils, *viz.*, the Council of Constantinople (553), and the Fourth Lateran in 1215. The last named Council declares that "all men shall rise again with their own bodies, which they now bear, to receive according to their works."

The doctrine is taught in the Old Testament at first vaguely, but afterwards with increasing definiteness. The prophets predict the restoration of Israel under the figure of a general resurrection (Osee vi. 3; xiii. 14; Ezech. xxxvii. 11), and refer to Christ's Resurrection as a pledge of our own (Ps. xv. 10). While the texts of Isaias (xxvi. 19-21) and Daniel (xii. 2) do not clearly assert a general resurrection, and the oft-cited passage of Job (In my flesh I shall see God—xix. 25-27) loses its force when compared with the original Hebrew; they are often cited by the early Fathers as proof of the Resurrection of the Body. The one clear and unequivocal text of the Old Testament is found in Second Machabees (vii. 10, 11).

Our Lord taught the Resurrection of the Body frequently, and attributed the denial of the Sadducees to their ignorance of the Scriptures (Matt. xxii. 29; Mark xii. 18-27; Luke xx. 27-38; John v. 28, 29; vi. 39, 40; xi. 23-26). His own Resurrection (Luke xxiv. 39-43; John xx. 20, 27, 28) in His identical Body confirms His teaching of our bodily resurrection.

St. Paul preached the Resurrection from the Dead as one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity at Athens (Acts xvii. 18, 31, 32), at Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 6), before Felix (Acts xxiv. 15) and before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 8), besides mentioning it in many passages of his Epistles (Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14; xv. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 14; vi. 1; Phil. iii. 21; Thess. iv. 12; 2 Tim ii. 11; Heb. vi. 2). He proves the Resurrection of the Dead from the Resurrection of Christ, declaring that "if there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then Christ is not risen again" (1 Cor. xv. 13; *Cf.* St. Thomas III., Q. lvi., art. 1).

All the early Fathers teach clearly the Resurrection of the Body, for they were called upon continually to defend it against the universal pagan denial of immortality, and the Gnostic heresy that all matter was evil. While declaring that it could be known only by divine revelation, they showed that it was not impossible in view of the Omnipotence of God (St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Cat.*, 18), and they argued its fittingness from the fact that the

body had been the temple of the Holy Spirit, nourished by the Eucharist (St. Irenaeus, *Adv. Hæc.*, iv. 18). They also taught that it was unnatural to deprive the body of its share in the soul's future reward or punishment (St. Clement, *Ad Cor.*, i. 25), and often appealed to analogies in nature and in revelation, such as the seed dying and springing up again, the succession of the seasons, the sign of Jonah the prophet (Matt. xii. 40).

The dogma of the Resurrection of the Dead implies more than the immortality of the soul; it teaches a real and complete resurrection of man in the fullness of his nature. There is a three-fold identity in the risen man which makes him the same human person he was from birth: identity of soul, identity of bodily life, and identity of the ultimate material substance of his body. All Catholic theologians agree that there is complete identity of soul, for the soul is the chief factor in determining personal identity. All agree also in holding that the giving back of man's bodily life is the very heart of the Resurrection miracle and mystery. But while the majority of theologians are in favour of the identity of matter in man's natural and risen state, a minority hold that such material identity is unnecessary. We are well aware that the material substance of which the body is composed is continually changing, but reason and experience tell us that this ever continuing process in no way interrupts the vital identity of the body from infancy to old age.

Catholics believe with St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 42-44) that the risen body will possess added qualities, which in no way interfere with their substantial sameness. It will be impassible, i. e., immortal and incorrupt. "It shall rise in incorruption." "Neither can they die any more" (Luke xx 36). "It shall rise in glory," i. e., "shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43). "It shall rise in power," i. e., no longer subject to the limitations of space, like our Lord's Resurrected Body. "It shall rise a spiritual body," i. e., endowed with spiritual and supernatural qualities.

188. Must Catholics believe in a personal devil?

The Fourth Lateran Council teaches: "The devil and other demons were created by God good by nature, but they became bad through their own fault." God did not create the devil, but a pure angelic spirit, Lucifer (Isa. xiv. 12), who out of pure malice and pride rebelled against Him, and was condemned to Hell with the other angels he seduced (Luke x. 18; Jude i. 6; 2 Peter ii. 4; Apoc. xii. 7-9). The Scriptures mention him as the tempter of our first parents (Gen. iii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 3), of David

(1 Par. xxi. 1), of our Lord in the desert (Matt. iv. 10), of Judas (Luke xxii. 3), and of all mankind (Luke xxii. 31; John viii. 44; 2 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Peter v. 8).

189. Can you prove an eternal Hell ?

Reason cannot prove that hell is eternal; it can merely show that the doctrine does not involve any contradiction. We can learn of eternal punishment solely from divine revelation.

The Catholic Church has always taught that those who die in mortal sin are condemned by God to Hell forever. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) and the Council of Trent (Sess. vi., ch. 14; Sess. xiv., can. 5) both speak of the lot of the impenitent as "everlasting and eternal punishment" and "eternal damnation."

It is true that the Hebrew word *SHEOL* in the Old Testament generally means the grave, or the other world of either the good (Gen. xxxvii. 35) or the bad (Num. xvi. 30). It has that meaning sometimes even in the New (Acts ii. 27; Apoc. xx. 13). The Jews had at first a very vague idea of the hereafter, although God protected them always from falling into the current pagan errors of pantheism, dualism and metempsychosis (*Dictionnaire de la Bible*, iv. 1316). They believed in the other world, but their minds were chiefly on this one, intent upon personal happiness and national prosperity (*Catholic Encyclopedia* v., 531). In the Pentateuch, Josue, Judges and Kings there is no explicit distinction between the lot of the good and the wicked in the hereafter. Job is the first to assert the reward of the just in the other life, thus implicitly proclaiming the punishment of the wicked (xiv., xvi., 8). The Psalms (xlviii., lxxii., xci., xcv., cix.); Ecclesiastes (xi., xii.); Proverbs (x., xi., xiv., xxiv.), and the minor prophets (Joel iii. 1-21; Soph. i., iii.) speak of a divine Universal Judgment, clearly implying the punishment hereafter of the wicked. Isaias (lxxvi.), Ezechiel (xxxii.) and Daniel (xii.) mention the eternal punishment of the wicked.

The New Testament teaches the doctrine of Hell clearly. St. John the Baptist insists upon it to urge his hearers to do penance for their sins (Matt. iii. 10, 12; Luke iii. 7, 9, 17; John iii. 36). In asking men to follow Him and believe His Gospel, Christ continually tells them that their eternal salvation is at stake; that if they die in their sins they will merit eternal punishment. Thus He warns them against the sin, against the Holy Ghost (Matt. xii. 32), and the sin of scandal (Matt. xviii. 8); He urges the duty of fraternal charity (Matt. v. 32),

and the virtue of chastity—all under the penalty of Hell. The Kingdom of Heaven is for those "who do His Father's will," the penalty of Hell for "the workers of iniquity" (Matt. vii. 21-23.)

Many of our Lord's parables end with the condemnation to Hell of the wicked; *v. g.*, the parable of the tares and the wheat (Matt. xiii. 24-30), of the net (Matt. xiii. 47-50), of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 18-31), of the great supper (Luke xiv. 16-24), of the royal wedding feast (Matt. xxii. 1-14), of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 1-13), and of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14-30).

In His description of the Last Judgment our Lord pictures the final separation of the good from the wicked, to whom He will say: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. xxv. 41).

Some have pretended that the Gospel of St. John contradicts Christ's teaching in the Synoptics, but this is not true, for the future destiny of man is always pictured under the general idea of eternal life or eternal loss (John iii. 3, 15, 16; vi. 40, 55, 59; xii. 25, 48, 50; xvii. 2; xx. 31).

The Apostles repeat the Lord's teaching. St. Peter says that false prophets and lying teachers shall perish in their corruption, and be tormented in Hell like the rebel angels (2 Peter ii. 1, 4, 9, 12). St. Jude speaks of ungodly men, deniers of Christ, who, like the fallen angels and the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, shall suffer the punishment of eternal fire and shall be cast into eternal darkness (Jude 4, 6, 7, 8, 12). St. Paul speaks of eternal punishment (2 Thess. i. 6-9; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19-21; Eph. v. 5).

Universalists have held that the Greek word *aionios* does not mean everlasting, but age long, *i. e.*, a long period, but not an unending one (Matt. xxv. 46). But the same Greek word is used for "everlasting life" and for "everlasting punishment." As no one holds that the reward of the just will come to an end, is it not unreasonable to suppose that Christ meant the punishment of the wicked to cease after a time? Oxenham says: "If Christ had intended to teach the doctrine of eternal punishment, could He possibly have taught it in plainer or more direct terms? If He did not intend to teach it, could He possibly have chosen language more certain *a priori* to mislead, as the unbroken experience of eighteen centuries proves *a posteriori* that it always has misled the immense multitude of His disciples."

It is true that some of the early Christian Fathers denied the eternity of Hell, led astray by the errors of Origen (185-255), who believed in "a restoration (*apokatastasis*) of all

things"; *v. g.*, St. Gregory of Nyssa (395) and probably St. Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390). But Origen was condemned by a synod of Constantinople in 543, and again by the Fifth General Council of Constantinople in 553. With these few exceptions the Fathers are unanimous in teaching with the Scriptures the doctrine of an eternal Hell.

190. How can an infinitely good and merciful God condemn us whom He loves to the everlasting torments of Hell ?

Hell is indeed a great mystery,* and, like every other mystery of Christianity, is infinitely beyond the scope of any finite mind. The Catholic knows it to be a dogma divinely revealed, and he accepts it humbly and without question on the word of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. As the Apostle says: "How incomprehensible are His judgments, and how unsearchable His ways" (Rom. xi. 33). Do scientists reject a known fact, simply because they are unable to explain it ?

Is it honest for the unbeliever to ask in one breath: "How can a good God punish His creatures in Hell?" and in the next, "How can a world so full of wretchedness and misery be the creation of an infinitely wise and good God?" God is either too good or too evil, according as the unbeliever feels inclined to deny either Hell or Divine Providence. And yet in God all is one—His Mercy, Justice, Power and Love. It is only the limited character of our intellects that makes us set one attribute of God against the other.

The human race for thousands of years has yielded to temptation, and sinned grievously. God has offered us eternal happiness on the condition that we serve Him freely during the time of our probation. If, fully aware of this required service, and fully aware of his power to render it with the grace of God, a sinner deliberately refuse it, can he honestly call God unjust, for punishing him hereafter?

It is unfair to picture the unchangeable God gloating over the sufferings of souls in Hell, as if He were hardening His heart against their appeal for mercy and pardon. None of the lost have ever asked for mercy, and they never will. The will of the sinner in Hell is fixed in evil forever.

191. How could a good God predestine anyone to an eternal Hell ?

The Catholic Church has never taught that God predestined anyone to Hell. On the contrary the Council of Trent (Sess. vi.

can. 17) condemned the heresy of Calvin (*Inst.*, iii., chs. xxi., xxiii., xxiv.), who held that an absolute divine decree predestined part of mankind to Hell, and, in order to attain that end effectually, to sin. No intelligent man could worship a God who was the Author of evil, or a God who did away with our free will, thus making all merit or guilt on our part impossible. Calvin's teaching, which many of his followers to-day reject as unreasonable, is plainly against the Scriptures, which insist upon God's mercy being ever ready to pardon the most hardened sinners (Rom. ii. 4; 2 Peter iii. 9), and which teach that Jesus Christ died for all men (2 Cor. v. 15; John i. 29; 1 John ii. 2), and that "God wills all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4).

God is the Eternal Present, the "I am who Am" (Exod. iii. 14); with Him there is no past, and no future. Omniscient, He must know all things. He knows the future even, therefore, before it happens; it does not happen because He foreknows it. He knows what we will do freely; His foreknowledge in no way affects our freedom of action.

In human affairs, we can easily realize that our foreknowledge is in no way the cause of another's free action. For example, I warn a poor swimmer not to venture on a mile swim to a nearby island, or I warn a feeble old man not to cross a city street, until the signal lights order the cars to stop. If they refuse to heed my warning, I certainly do not feel in any way responsible for their deaths, although I foresaw them. In like manner God warns the sinner not to venture on the sea of grievous sin, and not to court the danger of temptation, for "he that loveth danger shall perish therein." Is God responsible for the sinner's eternal death, if he freely and deliberately choose to disobey His known commands?

You may tell me that the comparison is faulty—all comparisons are. You could not help your stubborn friends, whereas God could help the sinner by giving him more grace, so that he must needs repent. Why does He not do so? We cannot answer that question, for the distribution of God's graces is an impenetrable mystery. We are certain, however, that God gives every sinner sufficient grace for him to enter heaven, and that no one is lost save by his own fault.

192. What does the Catholic Church teach regarding the torments of Hell?

The Catholic Church has defined nothing regarding the nature of the punishment the wicked undergo in Hell. Her theologians unanimously teach that the sinner suffers a two-fold

punishment: the pain of loss, and the pain of sense. The pain of loss consists in the eternal separation of the sinner from God, and the realization that the failure to reach heaven is due to his own fault (Matt. xxv. 41; Luke xiii. 27; 1 Cor. vi. 9; Apoc. xxii. 15). This is the chief punishment of Hell, as the Fathers frequently teach.

The pain of sense consists in the torment of fire, so often mentioned in the Scriptures (Matt. xiii. 30-50; xviii. 8; Mark ix. 42; Luke xvi. 24; 2 Thess. i. 8; Heb. x. 27; Apoc. xvii. 8; xix. 20). It is generally held that the fire of Hell, although a physical reality, is not a material fire like ours (St. Augustine, *De Gen. ad Lit.*, xii., 32; St. John Damascene, *De Fide Orth.*, iv., 27). We know that until the General Judgment the lost souls will have no bodies, and after it their bodies will be such that no fire can destroy them. It is useless to speculate about its true nature, and more sensible to confess our ignorance in a question that evidently exceeds human understanding.

193. Is it not unjust to punish a few years of sin with eternity of punishment?

No, it is not unjust. The comparison should be made not between this short life of ours and eternity, but between a sinner eternally obdurate in sin and a God all Holy, "whose eyes are too pure to behold evil" (Habacuc i. 13).

Even if we had a thousand years of probation, would that in any way alter the problem? What indeed would ten thousand years be in comparison with eternity? In fact we should thank God that the time of our probation and danger is so short. We can make a definite choice of God in one minute, as many a death-bed repentance proves. God says to us: "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Choose, therefore, life" (Deut. xxx. 19).

194. Is Heaven a place or a state of the soul?

Heaven is both the eternal happiness and the eternal dwelling place of the just in the life to come. It is called the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v. 3), the kingdom of God (Mark ix. 46), the kingdom of the Father (Matt. xiii. 43), the kingdom of Christ (Luke xxii. 30), the city of God (Heb. xii. 22), paradise (2 Cor. xii. 4), life everlasting (Matt. xix. 16), the crown of life (James i. 12), of justice (2 Tim. iv. 8), of glory (1 Peter v. 4), and our eternal inheritance (Heb. ix. 15).

The supernatural happiness of Heaven consists in the intuitive vision of the Divine Essence. "Now we see in a mirror, obscurely;

but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known" (1 Cor. xiii. 12). This doctrine was defined by Benedict XII in 1336, and by the Council of Florence in 1439. To enable the intellect to see God, it is supernaturally perfected by the light of glory, as the Council of Vienna defined in 1311.

No one can enter Heaven unless he is free of sin (Agn. xii. 27), in the state of justice and friendship of God. His supreme happiness excludes all evil, physical or moral. "And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall mourning or wailing or pain be any more, because the first things are passed away" (Agn. xii. 4; Cf. vii. 16).

The eternal happiness of Heaven (Luke xii. 35; xii. 9; 1 Peter v. 4; 2 Peter i. 11) admits of various degrees. "He who soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly; and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap blessings" (2 Cor. ix. 6; Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 41; John xiv. 2).

The soul's intimacy with God in Heaven, its relationship with the saints, its immunity from sin, are joys that the human mind cannot grasp. "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him" (1 Cor. ii. 9; Ps. xiv. 9; Isa. lxv. 4).

195. How could a man be happy in Heaven, if he knew that his beloved relatives and friends were in Hell?

Heaven consists in the Beatific Vision, which implies that the saints view everything from the viewpoint of God. The sufferings of the lost in Hell can no more interfere with our happiness in Heaven than they interfere with the happiness of God. In this life it is natural that we should be most unhappy at the thought of anyone being condemned to Hell. That is why saintly men and women devote their lives to the service of their brethren, striving to win sinners to God by their prayers and their many works of charity.

But in the life to come our feelings must necessarily undergo a change. We will no more sympathize with the lost than we sympathize with the devils; we will realize that they were condemned justly after having refused every proffered grace of God. We will realize that they hate God with an eternal hatred, and that their sins have driven out of their souls everything that on earth made them lovable.

196. What is meant by "the Communion of Saints"?

The Communion of Saints is the spiritual union which unites the faithful upon earth, the souls in Purgatory, and the saints in Heaven in the one Mystical Body, the Church, of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and the participation of all in the one supernatural life. The saints by their closeness to God obtain of Him many graces and favours for the faithful on earth and the souls in Purgatory; the faithful on earth by their prayers and good works honour and love the saints, and succour the suffering souls by their prayers, and the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

The Gospels speak of the kingdom of God as a divine, spiritual kingdom established by Christ (Matt. iii. 2; xii. 28; Mark i. 5; Luke xvii. 20), and united in charity (Matt. iii. 11; v. 48; Luke xii. 49). It embraces all the elect on earth and in heaven, even the angels (Matt. xix. 29; Apoc. xxi. 10-27). St. John speaks of this Communion as "the fellowship with us, and our fellowship with the Father, and His Son, Jesus Christ" (1 John i. 3). St. Paul speaks of it as the Mystical Body of Christ, of which all the faithful are members (Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 27; Eph. i. 22; Col. i. 18; ii. 19; iii. 15). All share the same spiritual blessings (1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. ii. 13-20), merits (Rom. xii. 4-6; 1 Cor. xii. 25; Eph. iv. 3, 7-13), and prayers (Rom. i. 9; xv. 30; Phil. i. 3-5; Col. iv. 12).

197. Where do you find Purgatory in the Bible?

The Catholic Church has defined the existence of Purgatory in the Decree of Union drawn up at the Council of Florence in 1439, and again at the Council of Trent (Sess. xxv.) which says: "The Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has from Sacred Scriptures and the ancient traditions of the Fathers, taught in Sacred Councils, and very recently in this Ecumenical Synod (Sess. vi., can. 30; Sess. xxii., chs. 2, 3), that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar."

The same Council taught (Sess. xiv., can. 12), in accordance with the Scriptures (Num. xx. 12; 2 Kings xii. 13, 14) that God does not always remit all of the temporal punishment due to forgiven sin. The Scriptures teach that nothing defiled can enter heaven (Wisd. vii. 25; Isa. xxv. 8; Hab. i. 13; Apoc. xxi. 7), and that Christians often die with venial sins upon their souls. All, therefore, who die in venial sins or with the temporal punishment of their sins still unpaid must atone for them in Purgatory.

The teaching of the old Testament is found in 2 Machabees xii. 43-46. After Judas had defeated Gorgias, he came to bury the Jews who had been slain in the conflict. He found under their coats some of the votive offerings, which they had, contrary to the Law, robbed from the idols of Jamnia. Judas at once prayed God that their sin might be forgiven (xii. 37-42), and "making a gathering, he sent twelve drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead." He did not consider their sins grievous, "because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them." The sacred writer then adds: "It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

It is true that Protestants consider the books of Machabees apocryphal, but they rest upon the same authority as Isaias or St. John—the divine infallible witness of the Catholic Church. Even prescindng from the fact of their inspiration, we may cite them as an historical witness of the Jewish belief centuries before Christ.

Our Lord speaks of the forgiveness of sins in "the world to come" (Matt. xii. 32), which refers to Purgatory according to St. Augustine (*De Civ.* xxi., 24) and St. Gregory the Great (*Dial.*, iv., 39). St. Paul, speaking of slight sins to be burned away and the "soul saved so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 11-15), refers to Purgatory, according to Origen (*Hom.*, vi., *Exod.*), St. Jerome (*In Amos*, iv.), St. Ambrose (*Ser.* xx., *In Ps.*, cxvii.) and St. Augustine (*In Ps.*, xxvii.).

All the Fathers of both East and West mention the Apostolic custom of praying for the dead, and likewise all the ancient liturgies of both East and West contain prayers for the dead. The prayer of the Roman Liturgy runs as follows: "Be mindful, O Lord, of Thy servants N. and N., who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Christ our Lord." The phrase "refreshment, light and peace" is found in many of the Catacomb inscriptions. The formula *In Pace* (In Peace), like our modern *Requiescat in Pace* (May he or she rest in peace), and the words, "mayest thou have eternal light in Christ," and "may God refresh you," are found over many a Christian's tomb in the first three centuries.

The Catholic doctrine is most reasonable. It follows logically from the fact that many die with the burden of venial sins on their conscience, or die with the temporal punishment due to their forgiven sins still unpaid. The average Christian commits

many a venial sin in his life time, for which he never craves pardon. The sinner of many years standing, who in God's mercy is pardoned on his deathbed, must in the hereafter, unless given a plenary indulgence, satisfy to the last farthing his debt of temporal punishment.

XIII. PRAYER

198. Why do Christians pray to God to inform Him of what He already knows ?

We do not pray to inform God of our needs, or to instruct Him what to do, for the All-Knowing God knows the inmost secret of every heart, and all its needs. We pray to God, because we desire to acknowledge His Power and Goodness, because we feel our utter dependence upon Him, and because He Himself taught us to pray by word and by example.

Jesus Christ taught us to hallow God's name, and to do God's will perfectly on earth as it is done in heaven ; He taught us to pray for temporal and spiritual favours, such as the grace to overcome temptation, the forgiveness of our sins, and the grace of final preservance (Matt. vi. 9-13 ; Luke xi. 1-4). He promised to receive our prayer when it came from a loving heart (Matt. v. 23, 24), saying to us : "Ask, and it shall be given you ; seek, and you shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened to you" (Matt. vii. 7). For "if you know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father from heaven give the good Spirit to them that ask Him?" (Luke xi. 1, 13). And again : "Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, that will I do If you shall ask Me anything in My name, that I will do" (John xiv. 13, 14).

He began His public ministry with a forty days' prayer (Mark i. 35) ; He spent whole nights in prayer (Luke vi. 12) ; He prayed when He performed miracles (Matt. xiv. 19 ; John xi. 42) ; He prayed in His agony in the Garden (Matt. xxvi. 39-41), and on the Cross for Himself and for his executioners (Matt. xxvii. 46 ; Luke xxiii. 34, 46).

"Pray without ceasing," urges St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 17) against the enemies of your salvation (2 Cor. xii. 27 ; Eph. vi. 11-17). The whole Christian life is a prayer of union with Christ in His Mystical Body (1 Cor. xii., 27 ; 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Eph. ii. 10-15).

Prayer is communing or conversing with God, as St. Gregory of Nyssa says (*De Orat. Dom.*). We not only ask God for favours,

as He Himself taught us to do, but we adore Him, praise Him, thank Him for His favours, and ask Him pardon for our sins.

199. Does not prayer imply a continual change on the part of the unchangeable God?

It does not. St. Thomas thus answers this question: "In order to throw light on this question (of the utility of prayer) we must consider that Divine Providence disposes not only what effect shall take place, but also from what causes and in what order these effects shall proceed. Now among other causes human acts are the causes of certain effects. Wherefore, it must be that men do certain actions, not that thereby they may change the Divine disposition, but that by those actions they may achieve certain effects according to the order of the Divine disposition; and the same is to be said of natural causes. And so it is with regard to prayer. For we pray, not that we may change the Divine disposition, but that we may impetrate that which God has disposed to be fulfilled by our prayers, in other words 'that by asking, men may deserve to receive what Almighty God from eternity has disposed to give,' as St. Gregory (*Diad.*, i.) says."

200. Why are not all our prayers answered, as the Lord promised (John xiv. 13)?

If we pray humbly (Ps. i. 19; Eccles. xiv. 21; Luke xi. 5-8) and perseveringly (Matt. xv. 22-28; Luke xi. 5-8, 9-13; xviii. 1-7) for spiritual blessings that will ensure our soul's salvation,—the grace to resist temptation, the pardon of sin, and the grace of final perseverance,—God will infallibly answer us.

If we ask spiritual blessings for others, God will pour forth His grace in abundant measure, but the sinner we pray for may resist God's grace even to the end. God will never force the human will, for He demands a free, not a forced service.

If we pray for temporal blessings, such as health, success, and fortune, God may grant our prayer by denying us what we ask. We must always pray in accordance with the divine plan. Our Lord gave us the example in the Garden of Gethsemani, when He prayed: "My Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from Me. Nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt." (Matt. xxvi. 39). St. Paul's prayer to be freed from the sting of the flesh was not granted him, because "God's power is made perfect in infirmity" (2 Cor. xii. 7, 9).

If sickness were to bring us close to God, and health make us forgetful of Him; if failure were to humble us, and success

puff us up with pride and arrogance; if poverty were to make us followers of the poor Christ (2 Cor. viii. 9), and riches cause us to abandon the faith, ought not God in His mercy and love refuse us what we in our ignorance crave?

XIV. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

201. Is not the wearing of medals a superstitious practice, akin to the pagan custom of wearing amulets or charms?

No, there is no superstition in the wearing of medals. The pagans attributed to the amulets they wore a magical power to ward off disease and death. Catholics wear medals to honour God and His saints, to bring to their minds some doctrine of the faith, or to attest their membership in some pious confraternity. They do not attribute any virtue to the medal itself, but they wear it to foster devotion. Would you call a man superstitious, because he wore a locket containing the portrait of his wife? Would you find fault with a soldier, who wore a medal given him for some special act of bravery?

202. Why does the Catholic Church condemn astrology?

The Catholic Church condemns astrology as a pagan superstition, which by encouraging fatalism leads to the denial of Divine Providence. The stars exercise no influence whatever upon human life and human affairs, and the casting of a horoscope or diagram of the heavens at the birth of a child in order to foretell its future is downright folly.

203. Does the Catholic Church allow a Catholic to attend a Spiritistic séance or to become a Medium?

No, the Catholic Church forbids Catholics to have anything to do with Spiritism, which she condemns as a superstition, destructive alike of morals and religion. The Holy Office has issued at least five decrees (1840, 1847, 1856, 1898, 1917) forbidding Catholics "to be present at spiritistic communications and manifestations of every kind, with or without a medium, even though they appear to be good and honest; either by interrogating souls or spirits, or hearing their answers, or by simply looking on, even though one tacitly or expressly protests that he does not wish to have anything to do with evil spirits" (April 24, 1917).

Spiritism is simply a modern form of the pagan necromancy condemned by the law of Moses. "Neither let there be found among you anyone that consulteth with them that are dead" (Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27; Isa. viii. 19).

While pretending to be a "new revelation," Spiritism is a pagan superstition, which denies every dogma of the Christian Gospel in the name of an imagined communion with the dead—a cruel parody of the Communion of Saints. Its God is either an impersonal World-Soul, or a vague Unknowable, whom we must not worship, and to whom we must not pray. Its Christ is a purely human Medium, a great spirit, who did not die on the Cross for man's salvation, because the fall of man is a "baseless figment," and sin in the Christian sense an absurdity. Death is not the end of our probation as the Scriptures teach, but the beginning of our education and development on one of the spirit spheres. The future life is pictured, not as eternal happiness in the face to face vision of God, but either as a purely mental state, or as a life akin to ours even to the drinking of a brandy and soda, as Oliver Lodge's son informs us (Lodge, *Raymond*). Hell is dismissed as "arbitrary," "unreasonable" and "contrary to common sense," a logical enough position once the idea of God is perverted, and the sense of sin destroyed.

The experience of the past eighty years has proved conclusively that Spiritism is attended with many dangers both to body and soul; it has frequently destroyed the physical health of its adepts, unbalanced their minds, and deprived them of the true faith.

The phenomena of Spiritism, physical and psychical, are most numerous and extraordinary,—the movement of inanimate objects without contact, apports, levitation, materialization, spirit photography, table-rapping in answer to questions, automatic and slate-writing, clairvoyance, and the like. We grant that these phenomena are often inexplicable, but the spiritistic hypothesis has never been demonstrated. Apart from fraud which is seldom absent, we may explain these phenomena by telepathy, the sitters unconsciously voicing through the medium their emotions or thoughts; or by diabolism, evil spirits using the medium as a means of undermining the morals or of destroying the faith of the curious and the unthinking. Interesting accounts of Spiritistic phenomena abound in Fr. Thurston's *The Catholic Church and Spiritism*.

204. Is it a sin to use the ouija-board or planchette ?

It is not sinful if one regards the ouija-board as a plaything and believes that its message is produced merely by the unconscious movements of the one operating it. But it is sinful, if one takes the answers seriously, and superstitiously consults the planchette as he would consult a fortune-teller. Raupert testifies to its use by evil spirits, and quotes Dr. Carrington with regard to its harmful effects. He writes: "Sometimes a message is jerked in here and there, which is often seen at once to be no part of the experimenter's mental outfit. Events taking place at a distance are accurately reported and commented upon. Disclosures are made respecting the character, doings and intimate affairs of persons not known to the experimenter." The present writer has come across Catholics who were physical and mental wrecks from the long-continued practice of automatic-writing, that began with their playful use of the ouija-board.

205. Why and when was the Sabbath changed from Saturday to Sunday ?

The Third Commandment of the Old Law: "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day" (Exod. xx. 8) was partly moral, the natural law obliging all men to devote some time exclusively to the worship of God, and partly ceremonial in as much as it determined the time and the details of its observance.

It is true that the Church could not abrogate the natural law, but the Apostles, as the divine infallible teachers of Christ's Church, could and did change the time, the motive and the details of the Sunday observance. They substituted the first day of the week, Sunday, for the seventh, Saturday; they made it commemorate the Resurrection of Christ instead of the Creation of the world (Exod. xx. 11); they mitigated in great measure the severity of the Jewish law, abolishing, for example, the death penalty (Exod. xxxi. 15) and certain prohibitions (Exod. xxxv. 3).

"The observance of the Sunday was at first supplemental to that of the Sabbath, but in proportion as the gulf between the Church and the Synagogue widened, the Sabbath became less and less important, and ended at length in being entirely neglected" (Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 47). We find the first day of the week called *The Lord's Day* by St. Paul (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2) and St. John (Apoc. i. 10), and *Sunday* by St. Justin Martyr (165) in his First Apology (lx.). That it commemorated Christ's Resurrection is mentioned by St. Ignatius (107; *Ad Magnes.*, ix.) and the *Epistle* of Barnabas (96; ch. xv.).

The Catholic Church requires her children to keep the Sunday holy by hearing Mass, and by resting from servile work.

The attendance at Sunday Mass is mentioned by St. Paul (Acts x. 7) and by The Teaching of the Apostles (II) ch. c. "On the Lord's Day come together and break bread. After the Eucharist allow yourselves your sins, that your consciences may be pure." St. Justin Martyr (II) describes in detail the Sunday Mass with its prayers, preaching, and the reading of the Old and New Testament (Apol., lxx.).

The Church commands us to hear Mass under grievous sin, because she considers the deliberate refusal to attend public worship on Sunday an insult to Christ, who is really and effectively present upon our altars, and who as Priest and Victim in the Sacrifice of the Mass, carries on the work of Calvary by expiating the divine wrath, and obtaining mercy and forgiveness for us sinners.

The obligation of hearing Mass ceases for weighty reasons. The Church excuses the sick and convalescent, those caring for the sick, soldiers or servants on duty, mothers who cannot leave their children, people who live miles from church, etc.

The Church forbids servile work, i. e., the rougher kind of manual labour performed to-day by ordinary workmen and of old by slaves. The object of the law is to enable all men, especially the poor, to hear Mass and to approach the Sacraments. The Church has never forbidden us innocent amusements on Sunday, provided we first attend Mass.

206. Were Christ and the early Christians communists?

No, they were not, although Socialists have often made this assertion.

Christ never condemned private ownership as unjust. While insisting upon the dangers of riches (Matt. xix. 24), and picturing in a parable the heartless rich man in hell (Luke xvi. 19). He admits the possibility of the rich man, who is faithful to God's law, attaining the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt. xix. 24). If Christ had repudiated private ownership unheeded He would not have counselled the rich young man to *sell* what he possessed (Matt. xix. 21), nor would He have been content with Zachens giving only *one-half* of his goods to the poor (Luke xix. 8). Instead of condemning private property, our Lord insists upon its proper distribution in works of mercy, as one of the conditions of gaining the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xxv. 35, 36).

The communism of the Jerusalem Christians (Acts ii. 44,

45) was similar to the common life of our religious communities, but it in no way implied a denial of private ownership. It was a purely voluntary agreement, as we learn from St. Peter's words to Ananias, "Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" (Acts v. 4).

Dr. John A. Ryan has ably refuted the charge of socialism or communism brought against the early Fathers. He proves conclusively that not one of them denied either explicitly or implicitly the right of private property. While they denounced many of the rich men of their day for having acquired their wealth unjustly, and insisted upon a Christian devoting his superfluous goods to the poor, they themselves retained personal ownership of part of their estates (St. Basil, St. Ambrose), and taught with St. Jerome that "wealth is not an obstacle to the rich man, if he uses it well" (*Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers*).

207. Why is the Catholic Church opposed to Socialism ?

The Catholic Church condemns Socialism, not because she has any special brief for the rich, but because she upholds the moral right of private property, which Socialism denies. Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclicals, *Apostolici Muneris* (1878) and *Rerum Novarum* (1891), declared that "the proposals of Socialism are emphatically unjust, because, by destroying private property, they would rob the lawful possessor, bring the state into a sphere that is not its own, and cause complete confusion in the community."

Catholic moralists have always admitted the evils of the modern capitalism; its avarice and greed, its contempt for justice, its enslavement of the poor, its control of governments, its excessive love of gambling and speculation, its shirking of personal responsibility, its manipulation of the press and the like. But while fully admitting these evils, they hold that they are less than the evils attendant upon Socialism. For Socialism is a quack cure, worse than the disease, just as suicide is the unbeliever's cure for an unhappy life, and divorce the cure of a libertine's unhappy marriage.

Catholic moralists, again, teach that the right of property in material things is a moral right, founded in human nature. It belongs not merely to the community at large, but to private corporations, families and individuals. Every man has the right, not only to a general use of nature's bounty, but to the possession of goods as his own. This right extends, not only over objects

means to use, such as food, shelter, and clothing, but also upon private ownership in production, such as land, mines, railroads, factories, stores, banks, etc.

The control of private willows such as telegraphs, railroads and highways by States or municipalities is not taxation, nor would the State ownership of any particular industry such as coal-mining be Socialistic if such control were demanded by the public good. It would, however, be manifestly unjust for the State to take over the mines or the railroads without giving due compensation to their private owners.

On the other hand the Church has always insisted upon the limitations of the right of private ownership, a principle also then ignored by the pre-Reformation communists, who held that a man could do what he pleased with his own property. The private owner is a steward of his property according to Catholic teaching, and must so use it that other men may enjoy its benefits on certain just conditions. The right use of property must provide the worker with a living wage, and enable the consumer to buy what he needs at a just price. If injustice is being done, the State has a right to interfere to enforce the just limitations of private ownership. Pope Leo XIII says: "Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers or is threatened with injury, which can in no other way be met or prevented, it is the duty of the public authority to intervene" (*Ennen Encyclical*).

242. Is suicide ever permitted?

Suicide is the intentional causing of one's death, either directly (as by taking poison, shooting oneself, etc.) or indirectly (by exposing oneself to certain death without just cause). It is not true that all who commit suicide are insane, though many undoubtedly are. Suicide is forbidden by the Fifth Commandment—"Thou shalt not kill"—and reason rightly regards it as an act of covetousness, as well as of ingratitude for God's great gift of life and the chance which life is of winning everlasting happiness.

A woman does not commit suicide who to avoid an assault on her virtue jumps through a window to death. Her intention was not to cause her death, but to preserve her honour, and to do this she took what appeared to her the only means, exposing herself to more or less certain death. For a just cause she exposed herself to death. Likewise, it is not suicide for a passenger on a sinking ship to hand over his life-belt to another who has none. He too exposes himself to death for a just cause, namely, the saving of another's life. "Greater love than

this hath no man than that he lay down his life for another." (John xv. 13).

209. Is not capital punishment murder ?

The Catholic Church has always taught that the State has the right to inflict death for grievous crime, and thereby to preserve public order and security. St. Thomas expressly states that "such killing is not murder" (IIa. IIæ., Q. 100, art. 8, ad. 3). Pope Innocent III declared against the Waldensians that "the secular power could inflict the death penalty without grievous sin" (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, No. 425).

The Old Testament prescribed the death penalty for certain crimes (Gen. ix. 6; Exod. xxi. 12, 14, 23; Lev. xx. 2; xxiv. 17; Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 12). The New Testament takes it for granted that the State has the right to put criminals to death (John xix. 10, 11; Acts xxv. 11), because it is "God's minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil" (Rom. xiii. 4). While clearly asserting the right of capital punishment, the Church has never demanded its infliction as the only possible deterrent of crime, however heinous. That she leaves to the judgment of the individual citizens.

The one convincing argument for capital punishment is the State's right of self-defence. Just as the individual has the right to defend his life against the attacks of an unjust aggressor, so the State has the right to defend itself against external (war) and internal enemies (capital punishment), who by their crimes undermine the very foundations of the social order. "The slaying of an evildoer is lawful," says St. Thomas, "inasmuch as it is directed to the welfare of the whole community" (IIa IIæ., Q. 64, art. 3).

Many to-day deny the right of capital punishment, because they deny the freedom of the will, and consider crime as a disease due to heredity or environment. They would segregate the criminal indeed as one segregates the man afflicted with smallpox in a pest-house, but they deem imprisonment ample punishment even for the most heinous murder.

Others will tell you that life imprisonment is more severe and more effective a punishment than the death penalty. We do not think this true with regard to the vast majority of criminals. There is no escaping death, which is the most striking of terrors, but "the lifer" can always look forward hopefully to a possible escape or a possible pardon.

It is certainly more in harmony with the Gospel to limit the death penalty to certain grave crimes like murder, piracy

or treason. Blackstone in his *Commentaries* rightly condemned the English laws of the eighteenth century which made one hundred and sixty offences liable to capital punishment (Book VI., ch. 1).

210. Is not vivisection immoral, involving as it does great cruelty to animals? Have we no duties towards them?

No, vivisection is licit and moral, for animals were created for the service of man (Gen. ix. 3; Deut. iv. 19; Ps. viii. 8), and therefore "man without injustice uses them, either by killing them, or in any other way" (*Contra Gentiles*, Lib. iii., ch. 112, n. 7). To talk about their rights and our duties towards them is nonsense. Cardinal Newman well says: "You know we have no duties towards the brute creation; there is no relation of justice between them and us. Of course, we are bound not to treat them ill, for cruelty is an offence against that holy law which our Maker has written on our hearts, and it is displeasing to Him. But they can claim nothing at our hand; into our hands they are absolutely delivered. We may use them, we may destroy them at our pleasure, not our wanton pleasure, but still for our own ends, for our own benefit and satisfaction, provided that we can give a rational account of what we do" (*On Omnipotence in Bonds*).

There is no branch of medical science that has not been benefited by vivisection. It has led to many important discoveries like Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood; it has taught us the effects of many a poison and drug; it has advanced surgery by testing new methods of sewing up wounds; it has saved many human lives by its experiments in serum treatments, especially in hydrophobia. The true scientist never inflicts more pain than is necessary, and, wherever possible, he anaesthetizes the animals on which he experiments.

211. Why is the Catholic Church opposed to the modern science of Eugenics?

The Church separates the chaff from the wheat in the matter of Eugenics, condemning what is evil in the movement, and commending what is good. As Father Slater says: "The physical and mental good of the race of mankind is part of the object of charity. If the spiritual good of mankind be added to the list of objects, the end of Eugenics would be identical with that for which the Catholic Church exists and works. . . . Theology teaches that charity is well ordered. . . . While then, theology is quite at one with Eugenics as to the end to be aimed

at, it very cautiously scrutinizes the means proposed for the attainment of that end" (*Questions of Moral Theology*, 259).

The Catholic Church, while divinely founded to educate man for the kingdom of God, has never neglected to foster his physical well-being. She has always combated the body's two greatest scourges, alcoholism and venereal disease, by her teaching on temperance and chastity. By demanding absolute continence in the unmarried, both men and women, she provides for the spread of a pure race, and by her divine law of conjugal chastity she fights the chief foes of marriage—adultery, birth control and divorce.

To the two ways mentioned in the previous paragraph in regard to Catholicism's aid to true eugenics, Prof. J. B. S. Haldane of London University has recently pointed out a third. In a radio address last March (1935) in New York he declared, "If we could stop first cousins from marrying we could wipe out about one third of these (congenital, hereditary) diseases. Now there is only one great organization that discourages cousin marriages, and that is the Catholic Church. Catholic cousins within the *fourth* generation are not allowed to marry without a dispensation from the Pope." Prof. Haldane is not a Catholic.

"Moral theology," writes Dr. Bruehl, "knows nothing of an absolute right to marry. No one has the right to give existence to beings whom he cannot properly support, and who inevitably will become a burden upon the community. The right to marry is dependent upon fitness for the married life, and ability to fulfil the duties of the married state. Where the prospects are that an individual cannot live up to these duties, reason and charity counsel, if they do not dictate, abstention. Due consideration for posterity demands that those who can bring into the world only diseased and defective progeny, should forego their right to marry. If moral theology hesitates to bar them absolutely, it is because such a proposition imposes great hardship, and presupposes a degree of heroism that cannot be expected of the average man and woman".

It certainly would not be unjust to prevent mental defectives of the lowest grade from marrying, as they can have no adequate concept of the nature of marriage, and would only prove a burden to themselves and to the State. On the other hand it would be unjust to prevent the higher-grade defectives from marrying, for with proper training, either in special institutions or in the special classes of our schools, they can be and actually have been educated to accept and live up to all the responsibilities of the normal citizen.

All legislation on this matter we think ill-advised, because such intimate matters cannot safely be left to the regulation of public officials, often devoid of both religion and common sense.

212. Does the Catholic Church condemn the sterilization of the unfit, the mentally defective and the criminal?

The Catholic Church teaches that God alone has the supreme dominion over life, as man's Creator and Lord. Neither the individual nor the State possesses such absolute power. The individual may not wantonly take his own life, nor may the State arbitrarily take the lives of its citizens. The individual also has the right to his bodily integrity, and mutilation may not be inflicted upon him save for an urgent and just cause.

The surgical removal of a diseased organ, *i. e.*, ovariectomy, even though it results in impotence or sterility, is undoubtedly lawful, although many surgeons perform this operation without sufficient reason to follow out a questionable therapeutic theory, or merely to satisfy the wishes of a patient. Vasectomy is also lawful, when there is danger of death or idiocy.

Sterilization as a punishment for crime, although not in keeping with modern humanitarian ideas, is within the province of the State (Slater, *Questions of Moral Theology*, 265). The legal penalty for rape in medieval Catholic England was far more drastic (Bracton, *De Legibus Angliæ*, iii., 2, 28). But most theologians deem it "wrong, because as a punishment it is neither effective, nor necessary, nor reformatory, nor exemplary, nor reparative—it lacks every quality of a justifiable punishment. . . . It is not a punishment to the men upon whom it is done, but it is an unnecessary deprivation of an essential right of these men,—an excessive, ill-ordered attack on a primary right of man, and an act of violence against human nature and its Author, without adequate reason" (O'Malley, *The Ethics of Medical Homicide*, 264, 265).

Catholic moralists advance many reasons for questioning the right of the State to pass such laws. In the first place Catholics ask—who are the unfit? They cannot accept the ideal of excellence, held by the unbelieving materialist, and expressed merely in mental and physical terms, which utterly ignores the moral and spiritual factors in the problem. They abhor the Nietzschean ideal of the Superman, knowing that the most disastrous assaults upon civilization have been made not by the weak, but by the strong. While the Gospel of Christ does not glorify disease, pauperism or feeble-mindedness, it regards the sick, the

poor and the mentally defective as children of God, possessed of immortal souls, created for eternal blessedness, and entitled to the respect and reverence due to every human personality.

Again, while the fact of hereditary transmission of character cannot be doubted, the laws of such transmission are as yet shrouded in the greatest mystery. A State physician's mere guess work that a particular couple will give birth to defective and degenerate offspring is not a sufficient warrant for an operation of so serious a character. We do not convict criminals until they are proved guilty in open court. Are not the feeble-minded entitled to as much consideration?

Practically speaking, the inherent possibility of abuse, lurking in all sterilization laws, ought to be enough to erase them from our statute books. The wide classification given to the unfit, and the wide powers given by some States to the State Eugenist make possible an arbitrary State Inquisition, more tyrannical and more uncontrolled than the Church Inquisition of the Middle Ages.

Many reputable physicians maintain that the existence of a vast number of unsexed individuals in the state, would inevitably lead to the spread of immorality and venereal disease. Thus Dr. Hayes (*Introduction to the Study of Sociology*), Dr. Davenport (*Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*), and Drs. Queen and Mann (*Social Pathology*).

Finally, sterilization by State law is utterly inadequate to free society from the evil of feeble-mindedness and its attendant ills. Heredity at best is only one of the several sources of mental deficiency. It is wrong to place the emphasis on negative Eugenics, for as Dr. Todd says: "After all, will mere extinction of the known defectives touch the core of the problem? Not at all. Indeed, some critics hold that negative Eugenics is not Eugenics at all. The defective who would thus be eugenically exiled, so to speak, constitute but a tiny fraction of Society,—only one-half of one per cent" (*Theories of Social Progress*).

Dr. Todd's pronouncement is confirmed by that of the British commission which in 1934 thus reported to Parliament, "It is impossible in the present state of our knowledge about the causation of mental defect to forecast with certainty whether a child of any given union will exhibit mental abnormalities." The Commission's findings were based on studies like the following: 103 *mentally defective parents* (in England) had 110 defective children, and 228 normal ones, 78 of the latter group being "distinctly supernormal, a few of them possessing the qualities of genius." Sterilization would have spared the community those

1110 defectives, and robbed it of these 228 normal to supernormal and near-genius children! Again, 626 normal parents (also in England) had 1,032 children, of whom 86 were mentally defective. In other words, defectives can give birth to near-geniuses, and normal people can give birth to defectives. Sterilization of defectives thus risks robbing the community of superior children, and since normal people will not be sterilized, not being defectives, sterilization will be of no avail in preventing normal people from keeping the sub-normals in our midst.

Besides the pseudo-scientific and immoral method of sterilizing the unfit in order to prevent their having possible unfit offspring, there are the scientific and moral methods of preventing them having any offspring, by segregation and by inducing them not to marry.

213. Does not the Bible declare that all war is immoral?

The Bible never declares war intrinsically immoral. On the contrary, in hundreds of passages God approves (Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xxi. 3; Deut. vii. 1; Jud. iii. 1-4; 1 Kings xv. 2) and commands war (Jud. vi. 6, 7), and even works miracles to ensure victory for His chosen people (Gen. xiv. 19; Jos. x. 11-14; Jud. ix. 15; 2 Mach. x. 29). The God of Armies (Isa. iii. 1; v. 7; Osee vii. 5; Amos v. 14) often sends war as a chastisement for men's sins (Lev. xxvii. 24; Deut. xxviii. 40; Jos. xvii. 13; xviii. Jer. v. 14).

Our Lord's chief commandment was the love of God and the love of the neighbour for God's sake. If the world were faithful to it, war would become impossible. But a pagan nationalism often sets at naught the Christian principles of justice and of charity. In the New Testament, St. John the Baptist gives good advice to the soldiers of his day (Luke iii. 14), and our Lord praises highly the faith of the Centurion (Matt. viii. 10), but neither asks the soldier to abandon his calling as immoral.

Christ's words in the Sermon on the Mount are a counsel of perfection addressed to the individual (Matt. v. 39), while St. Paul forbids private vengeance as a grievous sin. Christ rebuked St. Peter for an imprudent act of violence, an action utterly uncalled for, as our Lord could have had twelve legions of angels to help Him had He wished (Matt. xxvi. 53).

The early Fathers never condemned war as intrinsically immoral. They (Tertullian, Origen) often objected to Christians serving in the pagan armies, because of the danger of apostasy. At any moment the Christian soldier might receive a command, which required an act of public idolatry.

While recognizing that war is one of the greatest evils that can confront a nation, the Catholic Church has always held that a just war is licit and moral. She condemns the pacifism of the Quaker who declares all wars incompatible with Christianity, as well as the pagan view that modern aggressive wars are a nation's right and duty.

For a war to be just, Catholic moralists insist upon the following conditions: A State can rightly declare war only when it is morally certain that its rights are being actually violated, or are in certain and imminent danger; when the cause of war is in proportion to the evils incident to the war; when every peaceful method of settlement has proved inadequate; when there is a well-grounded hope of bettering conditions by the conflict. If these conditions were fulfilled—they rarely have been in history—wars would rarely happen. (Stratman. *The Church and War*.)

Pope Benedict XV in a letter to the warring nations, August, 1917, declared that three things were necessary to prevent war and to bring about a lasting peace: the substitution of moral right for material force; an international agreement for the reduction of armaments; compulsory arbitration of all international disputes.

214. Does the Catholic Church approve of the teaching of sex hygiene in the schools?

No, her Bishops in Germany, France and the United States, and her moralists everywhere, have been most outspoken in their opposition to the teaching of sex hygiene in the schools. Detailed instruction in sexual matters is inadequate to furnish the sanctions and checks necessary to educate our children to purity, and it is morally harmful, because it increases the flame of sensuality it is supposed to quench. Mere knowledge of the consequences of sexual sin, imparted by teachers who are often devoid of morals and religion, cannot make a child virtuous; it tells him merely how to take precautions against disease.

The public discussion of sex details destroys modesty and shame, the two natural protectors of chastity. The true place for such information and guidance is the home, common sense and a love for one's own, prompting the father when to speak to his boy, and the mother to her girl. Catholic parents are taught that the virtue of purity is built on obedience to conscience and the laws of God, publicly from the pulpit and privately in the confessional, where the priest as another Christ acts as spiritual father and physician.

We mention two widely circulated little books that illustrate

approved Catholic methods of imparting sex instruction, Fr. Martinus's *The Difficult Commandment and Sex Education and Training in Chastity*, by Fr. Felix Knoch, O. M. Cap.

215. Is it not true that whereas you theoretically condemn lying, you allow it in practice by your teaching of equivocation and mental reservation?

No, this is not true. It is good for us at the outset to define our terms, so that as St. Paul put it, we may not "fight as one beating the air" (1 Cor. ix. 26).

Mental reservation is an act of the mind which restricts the natural meaning that the spoken words appear to bear. If I give no outward clue to my mental limitation of the spoken phrase, either in the peculiar wording I use, or in the circumstances of person and of place, I am using a pure mental reservation, or, in plain English, a lie. If I do indicate externally my mental limitation according to the usages of language and of social custom, I am using a broad mental reservation, which is always permissible and lawful.

Non-Catholics often confuse these totally different things and translate the Latin term, *equivocatio* (broad mental reservation), by the English word *equivocation* (pure mental reservation, or lie). If our questioner keeps this distinction in mind, he will readily grasp the doctrine of Catholic moralists.

A few examples will illustrate our teaching. An importunate visitor, who has called repeatedly at my home, and borrowed money from me which he never dreamed of repaying, is told by my intelligent servant, "My master is not at home." Do not the usages of modern society make it clear that I am not at home **TO HIM?**

Cardinal Newman gives a good instance: "What news from France, my lord?" some one asked of a cabinet minister. "I do not know," he replied, "I have not read the papers." No private citizen has the right to expect a government official to disclose a government secret in the course of an ordinary conversation.

A murderer is arrested in the very act of deliberate murder. He is allowed by our courts to plead "not guilty," the legal theory and practice being that he is innocent until his guilt is judicially proved.

A priest may be asked in court—he has been asked—to divulge the divine secret of the confessional, and he answers rightly: "I do not know." He does not know with a communicable knowledge, and all the courts of the civilized world grant him the right to guard inviolate the sacred seal.

Our Lord gave us a striking instance of a mental reservation, when He declared that the Son of God did not know the Day of Judgment (Mark xiii. 32). He certainly did know it, as all the Fathers maintained in their controversies with the Arians, the Apollinarists, the Nestorians, the Monophysites, etc. (Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de la Trinite*, i., 559-586). Like the priest-confessor just mentioned, He did know the fact, but the divine secret of the Day of Judgment belonged to God the Father, and formed no part of the mission He gave either to Christ or to His holy angels. In this sense He did not know it.

Catholic moralists divide secrets into three classes: the natural secret, which concerns our own private life, or the hidden faults of our neighbour; the entrusted secret, which refers to matters communicated to us under promise of secrecy; the professional secret, which pertains to facts told to priests, lawyers, doctors, and public officials.

It is not only lawful, but it is in most instances obligatory for us to keep these secrets inviolate. When impertinent people, either maliciously or stupidly, endeavour to wrest these secrets from us, we are perfectly justified in using a mental reservation to meet their rude and ill-bred questioning.

Apart, however, from the confessional secret, which binds always and under all circumstances, because of the divine law, there are certain cases when secrets must needs be divulged. A natural or an entrusted secret, for example, must be told, if a legitimate court authority demand it, to prevent injury to a third party or to the community in general. Even the professional secret loses its binding force, if keeping it implies the violating of a higher precept. Thus a doctor, who knows privately that a boy at a boarding school is suffering from smallpox that will infect the other students, is bound to inform the city's health board. Or again a doctor, who knows that a patient of his, suffering from syphilis, is determined to marry a girl without informing her of the fact, is in duty bound to warn the prospective bride of the danger to her and her possible offspring. Common sense tells us that if the literal observance of a professional secret would work great injury to either the private or general welfare, it must be disregarded as far as is necessary.

"Mental reservation, therefore," writes Father Rickaby, "is allowable only when we are driven into a corner by captious questions about a matter which we have a grave reason and a right to keep secret, and where we have no other escape" (*Political and Moral Essays*, 225). Lax opinions regarding its use

were condemned by Pope Innocent XI, March 2, 1679 (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 1176-1178).

216. Do not the Jesuits teach that the end justifies the means ?

According to elementary Catholic ethics an action is good only if all its constituent parts are good ; *i. e.*, the *end*, the *means*, and the *circumstances* of time, place and environment. If any one of these three sources of morality is bad, the action is evil. Let me illustrate this teaching by a few practical cases. If I give alms to a beggar out of charity (a good action), or play a piano concerto (an indifferent action) for the benefit of a charitable institution, in both instances I am using a good or an indifferent means to a good end—the end justifies the means.

But, on the contrary, if I give money to a politician in order to obtain a city contract, I am perverting a good means to a bad end ; if like Robin Hood of old I steal from the rich to donate an alms to the poor, I am serving a good end with a bad means ; if finally, I give my monies to a city hospital in order to be honoured by men, that circumstance robs my giving of all supernatural merit, as our Lord expressly taught (Matt. vi. 1, 2). In all three cases my action is morally bad.

If this calumny were true, why is it that bitter anti-Jesuits, like Pascal in the seventeenth and Dollinger in the nineteenth century, never dared mention it in their charges against Jesuit morality ? If this calumny were true, why is it that no non-Catholic for the past four centuries has been able to point out this teaching by any approved Jesuit author ? The thousand florins offered by the Jesuit Father Roh in 1852, and the two thousand florins offered by the German deputy Dasbach in 1903 to anyone who would prove that this immoral principle was stated in any Jesuit book, have never been claimed. The apostate Jesuit, Count von Hoensbroch, took up the challenge and even appealed to the courts to claim the reward. The Court of first instance and the Cologne Court of Appeals both ruled against him, on the ground that the passages adduced from Jesuit authors did not contain the sentence, "the end justifies the means, either formally or materially" (Mausbach, *Catholic Moral Teaching*, iv.).

In sanctioning the polygamy of the Langrave, Philip of Hesse, Luther and his friends, Melanchthon and Bucer, acted on the principle that a good end justifies a bad means. Luther's dispensation for Philip to marry Margaret von Sala was granted ostensibly to prevent the Landgrave's lapsing into adultery, but really to keep this licentious prince attached to the Lutheran

cause. Besides, Luther urged him to keep the matter secret for fear of scandal, and if questioned on the matter to call his second wife his mistress. "Deny the marriage publicly," was the advice of both Bucer and Luther, for "what harm would it do if a man told a good, lusty lie (*eine gute starke Lüge*) in a worthy cause, and for the sake of the Christian churches" (Grisar, *Luther*, iv., 51).

I have frequently met physicians who falsely accused Catholics of the very immoral principle they carried out in their everyday practice. For they made no scruple of taking the life of an unborn child to save a mother's life.

XV. INDIAN APPENDIX

217. Why do Catholics try to convert others to their religion?

Our Lord Jesus Christ commanded that the "good tidings", *i. e.*, the Gospel, should be preached to all peoples (Matt. xxviii. 18-20). Furthermore, without Baptism or a real desire for the same, no man can reach his appointed aim (John ii. 5). Thus the missionary aspect of the Catholic Church flows from the very essence of her doctrine, devotion to God and devotion to man. No one who understands Catholicism could ever ask this question. *Moreover, no one who labours hard to "convert" another to his own way of thinking has a right to ask this question!* Recently I was present when a prominent Hindi author pleaded with a certain very influential European for assistance in the excellent work of making Hindi the common language of India. Later that day this author told me that we Priests must give up our efforts to make converts to the Catholic Church. I replied, "A short while ago when you were pleading with for the sake of Hindi, you were yourself trying to make a convert. By what logic do you deny me the same right and liberty which you claim for yourself!"

That not all Hindus are opposed in theory to conversions may be seen from the following passages from a pamphlet entitled *The Hindu Mission, Its Ideals and Methods*, published by the Hindu Mission, Vanimandir, Calcutta. On pages 11 and 12 we read, "Regarding the second item on our programme of action, conversion, we may state that *every individual or group or Society has the right to convert another to its own views*. Now it is a well-established fact of history, that the existing non-Hindus, barring those classed as Animists in the census report, were once

Hindus and have wandered away for whatever reason. And it is a moral duty of every one who calls himself a Hindu to welcome cordially every brother who now wants to come back. Nor is there any sufficient reason why the benefits of our communion should not be extended to him who from inquiry or study is convinced of the excellence of the Hindu ideal in life and in religion. There is no rule laid down by the Rishis or the Shastras that the Hindu Religion must be confined to India and to men born in that faith."

218. Does not the changing of religions mean levity of mind and pride, thinking one's self to be wiser than the wisest ?

One answer would be to ask if it is levity of mind and pride for one to stoop down and pick up a perfectly good rope which hundreds of the wise had walked over without seeing. In other words, the wise *can fail to see*, being human after all. The person who realises that there is one among the wise that is more than human, that is *God-instructed-and-protected*, namely, the Catholic Church, is not light-minded when he leaves human teachers for it. As for pride—to yield to the truth is humility. Further, the Church will propose to his imitation One Who was "meek and humble of heart." (Matt. xi. 29).

It is levity of mind for one to change one's religion without sufficiently serious reason ; and to remain in a religion which one sees cannot be the true one is still greater levity of mind, as well as obstinacy and pride.

219. Is not one man's religion bad for another ? Confer the Gita, chapter three, verse thirty-five.

The Sanskrit text is "*Sreyanamathamna vapnash paradharmamathamasthitha madharme nidhanam sreyah paradharmo bhayanam*". According to the context the word *dharma* here means duty, not religion. A soldier should fight, and a Brahmin should study and teach. That is the explanation given by Sankara in his commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gita*. And in his widely-circulated Sanskrit-Hindi edition of the *Gita*, Gandhi, commenting on the passage, speaks of one man's *dharma* being to sweep and another's to keep accounts. (*Autobiography*, p. 69).

Modern India, with its ideal of equal educational facilities for all castes, and even for the depressed classes, sees the sweeper become a pleader and the accountant a doctor. Modern India thus appreciates what ancient India also would have admitted,

namely, that a man's duty may change with circumstances. For instance, it is the householder's duty to resist invaders. One night in pursuance of this duty a certain householder starts to resist a person who he afterwards finds is his own mother. At once his duty changes, he receives and welcomes her. So too, when there is a question of the Catholic Church, does the duty of the non-Catholic change. If he believes at all in his own religion—and he should, if he is sincere—he should resist the Catholic Church in her efforts to enter the home of his mind and heart. But once he recognizes her for what she really is—the mother of his soul—his duty changes, so that he is in duty bound to receive her.

220. Gandhi says India's religions are enough for her.

No doubt Gandhi included Islam as among India's religions, and also Sikhism, and the Brahmo Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Ramakrishna Mission, and Theosophy. And yet, centuries before these religions were born, the Catholic Church came to India! Indeed, convincing historical proof exists showing that the presence of the Catholic Church in South India dates back to the first century, when St. Thomas, one of the Apostles of Our Lord Jesus Christ, preached there. The Catholic Church is thus assuredly one of India's religions, as is further evidenced by the fact that about one out of every hundred, and in South India about one out of every thirty or forty, Indians is a Catholic. Ceylon has even higher figures, about one in thirteen. Even our priests—a group which Indian non-Christians are apt to think of as foreign—are upwards of seventy per-cent Indians or Indian-born. Many of them are to be found teaching in our seminaries and colleges, and nearly twenty-five Indians have been made Bishops.

If Gandhi's statement means that India's non-Christian religions are enough for her, we are forced to conclude that he would—whether in good faith or bad, we do not judge—have India deprived of further share in the abundance of God's gratuitous mercies to be found in the *God-established-and-fostered religion*, the Catholic Church. We may add, too, that he probably harbours the two following thoughts:—(1) Christianity is a western religion. (This is not true. It is a universal religion, whose Founder was born and lived and died in Asia). (2) Each country should have its own religion. (This is not true. It is against the very notion of true religion, that is, something supernatural, and therefore essentially independent of race or place).

221. Do not many Indians become Catholics by forcible or purchased conversions ?

Fr. Heras, the well-known scholar of the Bombay Historical Research Institute, wrote in 1933 a book entitled, *The Conversion Policy of the Jesuits in India*, which, from contemporary and unprejudiced sources, gave the lie to the calumny that Jesuit priests in the old Portuguese possessions of India made forcible conversions. The charge had been made specifically against the Jesuits, and was confined to Portuguese India. As the reader will see on page 85, conversion by force, far from being approved, has often been strongly disapproved by the Church, though there is no hesitation in admitting that, just as Catholics have disobeyed and sinned in other matters, so, too, in India and elsewhere, overmilitant Catholic rulers have on occasion used force as a means of conversion. Such Catholics have at least had this not unexceptionable justification for such action, namely, that it is a lesser evil to have the body enslaved than the soul; forcible conversions may be expected to lead through bodily duress to freedom of the soul, as the one in duress comes gradually to assent freely to the Church of his stern masters. Not an immaculate justification, to be sure, but one that is at least intelligible to those who, with Catholics, consider it better to be in chains and without sin than with sin and free.

As regards the second part of the question, suppose that all Indian Catholics have been paid to be Catholics, are not all soldiers paid to be soldiers, and are these latter less loyal for their wages ? But let us drop the supposition, for it runs counter to several hard facts : (1) Each year of late has been showing an increase of from fifty to seventy thousand Catholics in India, Burma and Ceylon. Large numbers of these are children of Catholics, hence hardly "purchased". (2) Many others are converts, numbers of whom have to suffer social ostracism, loss of employment, loss of friendships, contempt and other such-like things from communities which it is the custom to praise as never persecuting for religion's sake ! (3) If you will not believe the missionaries when they say—as they do—that they do not "purchase" converts, inquire at their bankers' how much money they have. You will find much poverty among Catholic priests in all lands, and India is by no means an exception. (4) The presupposition to the question about "purchased" Catholics is that Indian Catholics are pseudo-Catholics, not really convinced ones. There are such, alas, as there are in all countries, but do not gratuitously calumniate a large group of your fellow-countrymen by

maliciously taking it for granted that they are all barterers of their consciences!

222. Since God placed me in Hinduism is it not His will that I remain in it?

Those who say this never impress one as making much of its reasoning when it comes to worldly matters. If they are born in Bengal, and if later on they find it suits their purse or pride or pursuits to move to Bombay or Berlin or Boston, they never dream of saying they must remain in Bengal because God placed them there. Similarly, they never dream of arguing they must remain poor or ignorant just because God happened to permit them to be born of poor or ignorant parents. It is as unreasonable to refuse to better one's condition because one was not "born" to it, as it is to refuse to become a Catholic because one was born of Hindu parents. We do not serve God by being unreasonable, neither do we consult our salvation.

223. All rivers run to the sea, therefore all religions lead to God.

In the first place, all rivers do not run to the sea. A small map of Asia shows one river in Rajasthan and twenty-seven in Tibet that do not. So the illustration balks at the outset.

It does some further balking, too. For what is that little "therefore" doing in the sentence? Perhaps these parallel sentences may help us to learn. All politicians run to graft, therefore all religions lead to God. All jackals run to dead horses, therefore all religions lead to God. All motorists run to filling stations, therefore all religions lead to God. All Sahebs run to the hills, therefore all religions lead to God.

Utter nonsense?

What else but?

As much nonsense as the "therefore" of "all rivers."

But *this* is no nonsense. All men will be saved in all religions who sincerely endeavour to the best of their ability to (1) know what God, the Maker and Master of man and the Loving Father, requires of them, and to (2) live up to the best knowledge they can acquire on the matter, and to (3) repent of and forswear and forsake out of a sincere sorrow at least their more serious shortcomings in numbers one and two above.

(4) Those who fulfil these three conditions and are not Catholics will—with difficulty—be saved, not, however, because they are non-Catholics, but because they are really Catholics,

implicitly, unconsciously, unknown to themselves. (Cf. pp. 105, 107.)

(5) Those who fulfil the first three conditions above and are explicitly and knowingly Catholics will be saved easily and in more abundant measure. For, though no religion is without some smaller or greater measure of soul-saving knowledge and means, only the God-made religion—the Catholic Church—has full measure of both. (Cf. p. 26). This last thought makes us Catholics often examine our consciences and ask ourselves searchingly whether we are really trying to prove ourselves grateful for the abundance of God's mercies in our midst.

224. Christian lands are wicked, therefore their religion is bad.

It is an old proverb and a true that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Or, as Our Lord Jesus Christ put it in a similar case, "he that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone." (John viii. 9). A remark that applies to nations as well as individuals.

Many non-Christians are better than their religions. For instance, many a Mohammedan has one wife,—whereas his religion permits polygamy. Many a Buddhist has one husband,—whereas there are Buddhists in good standing who practice polyandry. Many a Hindu is satisfied to worship the unique "One without a Second" of the greatest Hindu thinkers,—whereas he could be a Hindu and worship gods and goddesses. But, with the exception of the Blessed Virgin Mary and possibly of St. Joseph, no Christian ever could be as good as his or her religion requires. For that religion sets before the Christian the ideal of striving to be "perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48).

Blame Christians then for failing—as so many merely nominal Christians do fail—to strive for such an ideal. Blame *bad* Christians for being bad *Christians*, and God grant that your blame will help our priests' endeavours to shame them into realizing that they are besmirching the fair name of Christ! And God grant that you yourselves will understand that if so-called Christian lands show themselves miserable examples of Christianity, the reason lies not in their being true to Christianity, but false to it.

Be not too hasty in passing judgment on others, whether nations or individuals. Much that is good is self-effacing, unanxious to attract attention or notice; whereas evil has ever enjoyed a good press. Ten thousand devoted husbands kiss their wives, and *that* is not news. But let one of them, especially if he is Mr. Eminent, kiss another man's wife! Immediately

cables are humming the world over, editors are working overtime, and millions of sensation-loving readers are pouring over the story as told beneath screaming headlines on front pages! And Mr. Eminent's land is judged to be a moral cesspool!

Or, take the late war, and the use it served as a proof that Christianity had failed. Yes, Christianity did fail there. It failed to *coerce* human wills which God had made free in order that they might freely—not forcedly—love Him. But such a “failure” is nothing new. It happens every time that Christians commit sin. Do you blame the Pope when Johnny slaps his sister? Instead, you blame Johnny, and give him a spanking.

225. Has not Christianity an inferior morality, seeing that it tells man to be good in order to be rewarded?

In the preface to his Hindi edition of the Gita Gandhi tells us that even good works done with a view to a reward are imperfect and faulty. They may, however, be rendered perfect “by unselfish work (*nishkam karm*), that is, by working and by renouncing the fruits of works, by consecrating all worn to Krishna, that is, by sacrificing mind, speech and body to God.” (*Anasaktiyog*, p. 10). Such is the doctrine which Gandhi declares, with enthusiastic devotion, to be the teaching of the much-lauded Gita. This “renunciation of the fruits of works”—*karmaphaltyag*—is likewise the point from which begins the contrast of Hindu morality with Christian,—to the supposed discredit of the latter.

In our answer we deal only with the “reward” of heaven, the ultimate and comprehensive crowning of sincere virtue. Christians are enheartened and encouraged to goodness by the thought of this “reward”; Christians humbly hope to attain unto it. And Christians understand it to be, not a glorified and unending holiday in a celestial Kashmir, not a matter of being one bright morning endowed with the wealth of a million Rockefellers, but an everlasting fulfilling of God's desire that forever and in an ineffable manner weak, blind, miserable man be blessed in knowing the Infinite God who has made him, and loving the Infinite Lover who has loved him!

Bearing all this in mind, let us return to the *karmaphaltyag* of Hinduism's great thinkers and propose to them the following dilemma. Either (1) the doctrine is subject to the same objection which its opponents bring against Christianity, or (2) it is identical with Christian morality. As regards (1): the proponents of *karmaphaltyag*, believing in the dogma of

re-incarnation, tell us that men must work out their Karma, must be willing to enjoy the fruits of their good as well as of their evil deeds. Further, as in each incarnation as birth they work further good and evil, they must keep on being re-born in a continual round of birth-death-birth-death-birth-death, and on on without end. Thus they never reach *moksha*, never fulfill completely the purpose of their existence. This fulfillment they can have, however, by sincerely renouncing *samsara* for all the "fruits of works." And the result—for there is a result, though it, too, is reckoned along with other fruits—is *moksha*.

To return now to the dilemma: the very objection which the proponents of *karmaphaligraha* make against Christianity can be made against it. For, however much these renouncers say they are renouncing "the fruits of works", they are in reality renouncing merely the birth-death-birth-death-birth-death miseries, and not renouncing the supreme reward, *moksha*. For, on their own declaring, they are conscious that their "renounced" works have a fruit—and the best fruit of all, escape from *samsara*! and whether or no they admit it even to themselves, they are, on their own showing, making the renunciation of a lesser reward (re-birth) in view of a greater—even the greatest!

Without pausing to remark that those who live in stone houses should not throw glasses, we turn now to the second horn of the dilemma: or (2) *karmaphaligraha* is merely a Hindu way—and, as we freely admit, not a bad way of expressing the nature of Christian morality. Man is made for *moksha*, says the Hindu; man is made for heaven, says the Christian. *Moksha* is "release, liberation, escape, deliverance from further transmigration, final emancipation" (Macdonnell, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*).

Leaving transmigration out of the question—this non-Christian dogma is considered elsewhere in these pages—heaven is describable in exactly the same terms. Only, Catholic theology is more accustomed to consider it from God's view-point than man's, or, rather, from both view-points, for both in heaven are supremely identical. That is, man finds his "final emancipation", and that final emancipation is the being delivered from all selfishness and the knowing and loving of God. Or, to say it again, man finds "final emancipation" by fulfilling the purpose of his being, the purpose for which God created him.

The last remark brings us to a distinction on which it is worth dwelling if we wish further understanding of so very difficult—precisely because it is so very simple—a subject. There are rewards and rewards. I work hard in order to have a bonus. I also

go faithfully through my "daily dozen" of setting-up exercises, in order to have good health. In both cases I succeed in having my reward, but in the one the reward is *not a part of me*—I refer to the fifty-rupee note that came to me as a result of my work. And in the other case my reward *is a part of me*—I refer to these hardened muscles, this well-behaved digestive system, this general feeling of physical fitness. In working hard to win the fifty rupees, I admit I was not altogether unselfish. My action was good, yet not precisely free of fault. But in working hard to win hard muscles, I was totally without fault. For I did not want hard muscles in order to use them on unoffending and flabby neighbours, (nor to be able to stand before my mirror and see what a Hercules I am). No! I wanted hard muscles—and all the rest that goes with good health—because I wanted to be better than I was before, to fulfil better the purpose of my physical—and consequently my intellectual and moral—being. Thus, the reward that is outside of me, that *is not myself*, may be selfishly sought, but the reward that is within me, that *is myself*, is sought without unselfishness. Is it selfish to be good in order some day to be better? Selfish to study hard in order later on to study better? Selfish to love God commendably well in order finally to love Him beyond all commendation? Is the lotus selfish when as the reward of its efforts it grows to a flower?

Finally, if there is no unselfishness in the effort to BE IN A BETTER DEGREE THE BEING WHICH ONE IS, there is, *a fortiori*, no unselfishness in effort to BE IN A BETTER DEGREE THE BEING WHICH GOD DESIRES YOU TO BE. And God sincerely desires you to be—if you also sincerely desire to be—finally and forever blessed with the experience of knowing that the fruit of sincere God-ward action is God, God known and loved in the state of "final emancipation" from all that is base and selfish!

226. Is Christianity dying out among western thinkers?

Yes, Christianity is dying out in the West among the hundreds—more than three hundreds in U. S. A. alone—of varieties of Protestant Churches. But this is nothing new. Four centuries ago, when the first Protestant Church—the Lutheran—arose out of an apostate Catholic priest's desire to start a new religion of his own, Christianity started dying out among those of his mind. That is to say, Christianity's realization of itself as not a "factory" in which many latest-model religions are constructed by men, but as a "school" in which one God-made religion is taught by a

God-sent-and-guaranteed teacher,—this much of Christianity died out among Protestant thinkers the very day Protestantism was born. And in the course of time, as other Protestant thinkers arose with more and more man-made religions, more and more of Christianity died out among them,—for instance, the belief in the universality of God's will that all men be saved, the belief in the Bible as God's inspired word, the belief in the Divinity of Christ, etc.

But Christianity is not dying out among western thinkers, if you mean that those among them who are Catholics are not now believing the unaltered Christianity of Christ as safeguarded and proposed from generation to generation by the Catholic Church. Here are two lists of just a few prominent western thinkers of the last thirty-five years who are authors of some two thousand important books and are either "born" Catholics or convert Catholics. The "born" Catholics are: Karl Adams, Hilaire Belloc, Cardinal Billot, Henri Bremond, Paul Claudel, M. C. D'Arcy, M. de la Taille, Abbe Dimmet, L. C. Fillion, Philip Gibbs, L. Grandmaison, M. J. Lagrange, J. Lebreton, Daniel Lord, Cardinal Mercier, Ludwig von Pastor, F. Prat, Agnes Repplier, Joseph Rickaby, A. D. Sertillanges, W. Schmidt, Fulton Sheen, St. Theresa of Lisieux, Francis Thompson, Herbert Thurston, J. J. Walsh. The convert Catholics are: John Aysoough, Maurice Baring, G. K. Chesterton, Christopher Dawson, Edid Dinnis, Carlton Hayes, Christopher Hollis, Vernon Johnson, J. Jorgensen, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Joyce Kilmer, Ronald Knox, H. C. Wyndham-Lewis, Arnold Lunn, Jacques Maritain, C. C. Martindale, Peter Maurin, Alfred Noyes, Giovanni Papini, Frank H. Spearman, Sigrid Undset, Baron Von Hugel, Michael Williams, Sir Bertrand Windle.

Some of these names will not be known to many Indian readers for—whatever be the reason—Indians are fostering in themselves distorted views of the West by reading the "after Christians" only, the men who like Bertrand Russell, G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, and the two Huxleys have never known anything but a mutilated Christianity—Protestantism—and a to them misrepresented Christianity, the Catholic Church. Read them if you will; read, for instance, Wells, *Outline of History*, but until you have read, Belloc's *Companion to Mr. Wells' Outline of History*, do not for a moment imagine you have an undistorted and impartial view of the modern western intelligentsia in its relations to Christianity. In other words, hear both sides—and precisely here is our complaint, Indians mostly hear the modern anti-religious side. And then they, on insufficient evidence, conclude that religion is failing in the West!

227. Are not many educated western Christians becoming Hindus or Moslems ?

This is not a fact. The exceedingly few who have of late years become Hindus or Moslems are regarded by their fellow-countrymen as exceedingly singular. Those who doubt our statement are invited to consult the official religious statistics of the various western lands.

But suppose that European thinkers were becoming Hindus, Moslems, Buddhists ! Suppose that even Catholic European thinkers were becoming such ! We who purpose, with God's grace, to remain Catholics our lives long would, of course, be sorry. We would not be frightened, though, or led to doubt that ours is the *God-given-and-preserved religion*. For, though we have argued and do argue that the Catholic Church has a proof of her claims in the fact that so many great minds find intellectual, moral, spiritual and cultural satisfaction in her, we do not argue that this fact is *the* proof for the Church's claims. Take from us this confirmatory proof of great thinkers of to-day being Catholics—you cannot take from us the confirmatory proof of great thinkers of yesterday being Catholics, the Augustines, the Aquinases, the Pascals, the Pasteurs, and so on—, and we still have the five unshaken foundations mentioned in the introduction, and the confirmatory proofs of the Church's unique and abundant fruits of holiness, her unabated and flourishing and united life in the face of the "gates of hell", etc. (Matt. xvi., 13-19. Cf. pp. 59, 69, 73.)

228. If the Catholic Church is right, then has not God shown favouritism to western nations by sending it to them first ?

The one who makes that remark forgets four things.—(1) since God gratuitously, without the least right or requirement on our part, prepares for man a greater than natural destiny He is perfectly entitled to give the *abundance of His mercies* where, when, how and to whom He wills ; (2) with the same right and the same absence of obligation to us He gives to all a *sufficiency of His mercies* ; (3) though He gives to all enough, He gives to some more than to others, and this for reasons that can have nought of favouritism or other imperfections in them, since there can be no imperfection in the Supreme Perfection ; (4) by sending His priests to India in the first and succeeding centuries He set up His Church here before He did the same in what are now usually considered to be Catholic lands, for

instance, Spain, Ireland, Belgium, Bavaria, the Tyrol, South America, parts of France, etc.

Further, there is Matthew, xi. 1-16. We read there that Our Lord Jesus Christ spoke a parable of the master of a vineyard who hired labourers early in the morning, other labourers later in the morning, more at noon, more at three o'clock, and still more at five. With each he covenanted to give "what shall be just", and at six o'clock when the whistle blew, each received a full day's wage. The early comers then murmured against the "five-o'clockers", saying, "These last have worked but one hour, and thou hast made them equal to us, that have borne the burden of the day and the heats."

Then the master of the vineyard said in answer to one that made this complaint, "Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take what is thine, and go thy way; I will also give to this last even as to thee. Or, is it not lawful for me to do what I will? Is thy eye evil because I am good? So shall the last be first and the first last."

This is one of those lessons which St. Paul had in mind as being among the things "written for our instruction." Think on it, and invited as you are to be at this late hour a labourer in Christ's vineyard, complain not if the Master of the Vineyard should say of you to those of other nations, "I will also give to this last as to thee.... So shall the last be first and the first last!"

229. Why should God be worshipped in church buildings? Are not these a waste of money that should be given to the poor?

It is true that God could be worshipped in various places, and not necessarily in buildings set aside for that purpose. Indeed, in the three centuries when the Roman Emperors persecuted Christianity, many a Catholic worshipped in pits and caverns, just as in Elizabethan and Cromwellian times many an English and Irish Catholic worshipped in cellars and forests, and just as many a Japanese Catholic did in the seventeenth century—when persecution made away with two millions of them—and many a Mexican Catholic does to-day. However, in times and places when governments do not make Catholic worship a crime and Catholic faith an offence, the Church, in virtue of the authority given her by God, ordains that worship must at certain times be conducted in church buildings. Such buildings are found by experience to be a great help to devotion and instruction and also union among fellow-Christians and others. Only an atheist would say that what is devoted to the service of God

is wasted. Others see that man's prime concern is that of his relationship to God, and hence nothing devoted to it can be considered wasted.

However, it stands to reason that where poverty abounds, church buildings should not be too expensive, and money given to the poor should be considered as given to God in their persons. In cases of great distress, it is proper even to melt down the gold and silver vessels of the churches for the relief of the poor, as Bishops of the Catholic Church have done in such circumstances.

230. Should we not settle the modern social problem (poverty, oppression, unemployment) before we think of religion ?

This is *almost* what the "Pope of the Workingmen", Leo XIII, wrote in 1891 in that famous letter which, from its opening words (in Latin), is known as *Rerum Novarum*. The letter has been translated into scores of languages. In English it is called the Encyclical on the Condition of the Working Man. We quote: "At this moment the condition of the working population is the question of the hour; and *nothing can be of higher interest to all classes of the state than that it should be rightly and reasonably solved.*"

We will comment on the italicized portion presently; here are some more quotation from the letter: "A small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself. Working men have been given over, isolated and defenceless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. . . . It is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power. . . . To exercise pressure for the sake of gain upon the indigent and destitute and to make one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine."

"It is one thing to have a right to the possession of money, and another to have a right to use money as one pleases. . . . There is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice. . . . We lay it down as a general and perpetual law, that workmen's associations should be

so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at; that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind and property..... The civil power is more than the mere guardian of law and order..... Whenever the general public or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with evils, which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them..... The law should favour ownership and its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners."

Forty years after this letter, in 1931, the present Pope, Pius XI, issued a similar one, known as *Quadragesimo Anno* (in the fortieth year). We have space for only a few quotations, showing that Catholic social teachings—based on Suarez and Bellarmine of the sixteenth century, Aquinas of the thirteenth, Augustine and Ambrose of the fifth, and so on—are still the same.

"The wealthy were content to abandon to charity alone the full care of relieving the unfortunate, as though it were the task of charity to make amends for the open violation of justice, a violation not merely tolerated, but sanctioned at times by legislators.... Every sincere observer is conscious that the vast differences between the few who hold excessive wealth and the many who live in destitution constitute a grave evil in modern society.... Unbridled ambition for domination has succeeded the desire for gain; the whole economic life has become hard, cruel and relentless in a ghastly measure..... Nowadays the conditions of social and economic life are such that vast multitudes of men can only with great difficulty pay attention to the one thing necessary, namely, their eternal salvation..... What a lamentable fact that there have been, and there are even now some who, while professing the Catholic faith, are well-nigh unmindful of the sublime law of justice and charity which binds us not only to give each man his due, but to succour our brethren as Christ, Our Lord Himself; worse still, that there are those who out of greed for gain do not shame to oppress the workingman... Indeed, there are some who can abuse religion itself, cloaking under its name their own unjust imposition, that they may protect themselves against the clearly just demands of their employees... Such men are the cause that the Church, without deserving it, may have the appearance and be accused of taking sides with the wealthy, and of being little moved by the needs and sufferings of the disinherited."

"It follows from the two-fold character of ownership, which

we have termed individual and social, that men must take into account in this matter not only their own advantages but also the common good. To define in detail these duties, when the need occurs and when the natural law does not do so, is the function of the government. . . . Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult workingman just such a wage. . . . In the present state of human society, however, we deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain both of the wage earners and of the employers. In this way wage earners are made sharers in some sort in the ownership or the management, or the profits." . . . Free competition cannot be the ruling principle of the economic world. Still less can this function be exercised by the economic supremacy which within recent times has taken the place of free competition. . . . All the institutions of public and social life must be imbued with the spirit of justice, and this justice must above all be truly operative."

Before giving these quotations we said that Pope Leo XIII. almost agreed we should settle the modern social question before we think of religion. "*Nothing*", he wrote, "*can be of higher interest to all classes of the state than that it should be rightly and reasonably solved.*" But there is one difference between the Pope and the questioner dealt with here in our answer: (1) The Pope and the questioner both believe "nothing can be of higher interest" than the solution of the social question. (2) The Pope and the questioner both desire that the question be 'rightly and reasonably solved.' (3) The questioner thinks the right and reasonable solution will come without it being necessary for religion to lead men to believe in and practice social and individual justice. The Pope thinks the opposite.

And indeed, one may well agree with the Pope when one considers that *the present social debacle came about precisely through men ignoring religion.* Those of them, who had a religion other than the religion of the "almighty dollar" variety, kept it in their prayer books for Sunday use, and on the other six days of the week defrauded and sweated and extorted as though there were no God in heaven to hear the cry of the poor and judge even Capitalists!

231. What is the attitude of the Catholic Church towards Swaraj ?

Some Protestant alleged that if the Pope were to command Catholics to be disloyal to the State in purely civil matters, they would have to obey him. The author of *The Faith of our Fathers*, Cardinal Gibbons, answered that by such a command the Pope "would stand self-condemned, a transgressor of the law he himself promulgates. He would be offending not only against civil society, but also against God, and violating an authority as truly from God as his own. Any Catholic, who clearly recognizes this, would be bound not to obey the Pope; or rather his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey." *In other words, the Church, as a Church, has no more concern with purely civil matters than an astronomer as an astronomer, has with the breeding of race horses.*¹

But since civil matters are not always purely civil matters, but are rather often matters that also concern morality, much has been written on them by Catholic authorities. We summarize four of the teachings of one of the greatest of them, a Saint and Doctor of the Church, Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621). Defending popular sovereignty against James I of England—the "Divine Rightist"—, he maintained that the natural or divine Law created political power in general; that such power was directly vested, not in any individual or king, but in the multitude of people, considered as a political unit; that the right to rule is not bound up with any special mode of government, but is determined by the consent of the people or the law of nations. "It depends on the consent of the multitude," Bellarmine's fourth teaching was, "to place over themselves a king, consul or other magistrate; and if there be a legitimate reason, the multitude can change the government. . . ."

This change, if it occur, ought, of course, always to be effected by moral methods, and as a rule by constitutional ones,—as these latter occasion less disturbance to the community, and if well-employed are sufficient to the end, and finally are a better warrant that the new government sought after will really be a *sua-raj*, a self-government, and not merely a triumph of disorder. However, at times governmental changes have come about through violence

(1) Even the non-Catholic realizes this, hence he is so often heard crying out, "No priests in politics!" However, the cry changes at times, and the same mouth protests that priests should enter politics—on the understanding, of course, that they agree with the particular protester. (O thou lovely jewel of consistency!)

and revolt. This method is within the right of the citizen body (1) *when* the people are oppressed by a lasting and intolerable tyranny, (2) *when* legal and pacific means of reform have proved useless, (3) *when* the revolt has a reasonable chance of success, and (4) *when* it is approved by the larger and better-minded portion of the people. If these four conditions really exist, *and exist together*, then non-constitutional change of government is justified; otherwise it is not.

The Church, as accredited messenger of the Prince of Peace, will, of course, be found favouring peaceful, constitutional methods of governmental changes, rather than violent ones. But should men wish to push their disputes to the point of violence, it will be rare that the Church will decide that in a given case the four above conditions justifying such a course really exist. For one thing, it is almost impossible to decide whether an existing government is really a tyranny, and really intolerable; whether all legal means of redress have been tried and have had no success; whether the harm done by the revolt may be permitted for the sake of the good expected to result, etc. Moreover, it is but to be expected that bishops and priests will, as a rule, be less conversant than men of the world with the facts underlying these questions. Hence, they will, as a rule, be reluctant to give binding decisions relating to them—all the more so that in such cases men of the world themselves not infrequently "dodge the issue". As a consequence, Catholics will generally be left to form their own decisions on the matter, relying on that common fund of human intelligence in which they are not denied a share; and enjoying that not inconsiderable assistance, the general moral principles which the Church expounds; and aided, if they so wish, by the advice of their spiritual directors. This advice, as applied to the intricate question of the four "whens" above, will frequently have only that cogency which the advice of prayerful, thoughtful men always deserves to have.

This advice, too, will normally be somewhat in the form of a cross-examination by "counsel for defence". The meaning is that as long as a given government is "in possession", the Church enjoins obedience to it in all things not contrary to the law of God. Those who challenge such a Government's right to be "in possession" must, accordingly, "prove their case", and cases are proved by facts, which, of course, it is for the challenger to produce. If he produces them before the Church, he will find her the "counsel for defence" for the Government, but only as long as the "logic of facts" has not proved the Government illegitimate.

232. What is the Catholic Church's attitude towards caste ?

Many things are done in the name of Caste, and the Church's attitude depends on whether they are good, bad or indifferent.

The word *Caste* appears to come from the Spanish or Portuguese *casta*, which means *pure* (in birth or lineage). It was applied to the divisions which have existed for centuries in India under the name of *varna* (colour). In the *Rig-Veda*, the earliest work in Indian literature that has come down to us, there are no castes, though in the later books a darker class of people are described as being the servants of the rest (*dasyu*). In the Laws of Manu, however, (circa 100 B.C.) we find four castes, which have remained, with many sub-divisions, down to our own day.

Castes may have been mere social and professional divisions at first, but religion soon put its inexorable seal on them and made them rigid, and to an ignorant, superstitious people, even divine. Accordingly, each caste became a watertight compartment.

(1) Socially... only those of the same caste may intermarry or interdine; (2) religiously... each caste has its own exclusive gods, rites and rights; (3) professionally... each one must follow the trade or profession of his caste—the Brahman alone can be a priest or a teacher, the Kshatriya alone can be a king or a soldier, the Vaisya has to trade, the Sudra has to till the ground and serve others.

Below these four castes are a number of men and women who have not been admitted into the Hindu fold, and are therefore casteless or untouchable. Such are drummers, cobblers, farm-coolies, etc., who are so low that they are not allowed to enter the temples where "Caste people" worship or to use the same wells, or even to approach within a certain distance of them, because they are "unclean".

What did the Catholic Church do when she made converts among Hindus?

She tolerated (the word is underlined because it has been insisted upon in many Roman documents on this subject) whatever was purely social or professional in the caste system, but *forbade* its religious applications, and showed that its *spirit* was entirely opposed to Christ's: (1) It is based on pride, Christ's on humility. (2) It is exclusive, Christ died for all (1 Tim. ii. 6), all are His brothers, all are descended from one man and one woman.

Hence the Church has always been the helper and uplifter of the outcaste and untouchable, just as she always pleaded for the slaves even when she tolerated slavery. But though her mind on Caste is clear, she does not want to condemn it as wholly evil.

233. What is the attitude of the Catholic church towards the Vedanta ?

There can be no doubt about the Church's attitude towards whatever is true, be that truth discovered and proclaimed by whomsoever. Accordingly, in as far as this or that Vedanta Philosophy—Advaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita, Dvaitadvaita, etc.—advocates doctrines really and objectively true, it meets the Church's approval. That there are such objective truths in various Vedanta philosophies; that they are not yet worked out into a complete system; that if these truths were brought together and the errors with which they are intermingled rejected, then they would form "a system, and that system would be Thomism (Catholic Philosophy), or something akin to Thomism" is the conviction of a steadily growing school of Catholic priests and oriental scholars who, since October, 1922, have rallied around *The Light of the East*, a very thought-provoking monthly journal of Calcutta. The reader is referred to the current and back numbers of this journal, as well as to various booklet publications of two of its most remarkable writers, the editor, Fr. G. Dandoy, S. J., and Fr. P. Johannes, S. J. Additional information is available in the issues of the large Catholic monthly, *The New Review* (Macmillan), founded also in Calcutta, in January, 1935.

234. What is wrong with idolatry ?

"The specific note about idolatry is its direct opposition to the primary object of Divine worship: it bestows on a creature the reverence due to God alone." (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, vii. 636). Hence, it is objectively, in itself, a mortal (serious) sin. However "no sin is mortal—i. e., debars man from attaining the end for which he was created—that is not committed with clear knowledge and free determination. . . . It is reasonable, Christian and charitable to suppose that the 'false gods' of the heathen were, in their conscience, the only true God they knew, and that their worship being right in its intention, went up to the one true God with that of the Jews and Christians to whom He had revealed Himself." (*loc. cit.*).

Thus do Catholic teachings (a) suggest an excuse for the

idolater, and (b) condemn *idolatry*. The reason for (a) is that the searcher of hearts is God, not the Church. The latter can judge with certainty only the outward act or word, but of the inward soul that *may* have mistakenly considered evil as good it can speak only with probability, unless that soul declare itself. The reason for (b) is that all giving of Divine honours to anything or any one else but God is in itself sinful. For (1) *such a giving is supreme injustice*. The reverence, love and service which belongs to God is given to another. (2) *It is supreme disobedience*. The reverence, love and service which God commands is, in the case of conscious, wilful idolaters, denied Him and given to another, or, in the case of unconscious, unwilful idolaters, is given Him, but not in the way and degree He desires. For His desire—which He has revealed to the Catholic Church—is that He be worshipped in the way and degree of the Catholic Church. (3) *It is supremely harmful*. For the conscious, wilful idolater commits grave sin and endangers his soul's salvation. And the unconscious, unwilful idolater is, by his habitual form of worship, put into great danger of being led to reject the Catholic Church, should it be brought to his consideration. Should it not be brought to his consideration, and if in the end he is saved (*Cf.* pp. 105, 106, 215), this will be in view of something that is hardly flattering to reasonable beings, that is, invincible ignorance. Moreover, this unflattering road of salvation, compared with the one of conscious and conscientious membership in the Catholic Church, is neither easy, nor free from great perils, nor endowed with that abundance of mercies which God is ever ready gratuitously to bestow on sincere Catholics.

The reader is also referred to page 178 for the Catholic use of sacred images. Ignorant or malicious people, seeing such in our church buildings, have often falsely accused us of idolatry.

235. Is transmigration true? How else are we to account for the inequalities among men?

Catholics believe that a man can determine his eternity by a free act that takes very little time, and that no further opportunities to determine this are granted after death. "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment." (Hebrews ix. 27). After death the soul is judged and either punished everlastingly or rewarded with the everlasting beatific vision of God, whether this reward be given immediately or, as happens in the case of those dying with some temporal punishment still to be undergone, after a certain amount of purifying

punishment in an intermediate state called purgatory. There is no transmigration, no rebirth.

The theory of transmigration is supported by no real evidence whatsoever. Mr. Durga Prasad, while President of the Arya Samaj, Lahore, and Pundit Srinivasa Sastrigal have argued that the instinctive sucking of the mother's teats by the newly-born child is an act guided by knowledge that the soul acquired in a previous existence. But psychologists place this act on the same plane as other instinctive acts, such as sneezing, crying, tossing about. It is difficult to imagine what, according to the transmigration theory, must have happened to the very first child and the very first animal. Why is it that the soul remembers only certain bits of information leading to acts we regard as instinctive, and not to knowledge about such things as building a nest—if the soul had been in a bird in a previous life, or knowledge of at least the first letters of some alphabet—if the soul had been in a savant or literateur in a previous life!

It is generally thought by Hindus that inequalities among men and even among animals are to be accounted for by the merits and demerits of souls in previous existences. This false notion is based on the idea that physical evil is necessarily and always connected with moral evil. Not every lack of physical perfection is to be attributed to moral fault. On the contrary, all created beings must be finite, and consequently *must* lack something or other in physical perfection. In creating man, for example, God was free to fix the height of His creature. He could have made him as tall as a mountain or as small as a chicken, or even as small as some invisible germ. That He chose five or six feet was due to His own supremely free will.

There are many other examples that help us to see how God created inequalities without any regard for moral deserts. Stars differ from stars greatly, and so do mountains and hills. Is there any reason why God should not have acted the same way when He created intelligent beings and animals?

The physical evils that strike the imagination and make men wonder whether transmigration may not explain the present state of affairs are often, upon a little reflection, seen to be for the best interests of the individuals concerned. We read in the ninth chapter of St. John's Gospel that Christ was asked whether a certain man who had been born blind owed his affliction to his own sin or to that of his parents. Christ replied that neither supposition was correct, the man had been born blind that glory might thereby be given to God. He thereupon proceeded to cure him of his blindness, and the people were

amazed at the miracle. In many cases of which we know, such afflictions as blindness are means to holiness and salvation. Is it not possible that as far as we can know from mere reason there may be good to be drawn out of the evils of life? Certainly, one can justly fear a theory which solves all difficulties too easily, as the theory of transmigration does. We expect some mystery to be left in the universe even after our best efforts at reasoning.

There are a fair number of difficulties that must be met by one who professes belief in transmigration. The theory is foreign to any idea of solidarity among intelligent beings, and ignores the obvious fact that men by nature strive for their ends with co-operation. There must be leaders and those to be led, teachers and those to be taught, and some must perform the humbler work of civilized society, while others sit at desks and plan. This is a disposition of nature and not the result of pre-natal sins.

Punishment is inadequate when the one punished has no memory of or consciousness of his sin. But such is the type of punishment meted out by the law of *karma* working through transmigration. Furthermore, what upholders of this theory often consider punishment is really not that. For instance, what punishment for a soul that enters the body of a pig? Pigs seem to enjoy their filth and generally to be as happy as any other animal, not to say as happy as many men.

Karma is a mechanical affair that leaves no room for the mercy and free bounties of God. Indeed, it has a tendency to atheism. In its extreme form it is not very flattering, to put it mildly, to the power of the Almighty or to the goodness of the Supreme Good. Again, although *karma* is supposed to explain the inequalities of life by unknown actions of past lives, yet it fails to explain the original inequalities in circumstances. Even if souls had been migrating without a beginning (*Cf.* p. 5) the fact of inequalities would still be without explanation.

By reason alone we have not disproved the theory of transmigration. We do not have to do that. It has to be proved by those who maintain it, and this they cannot do. For like many teachings of Hinduism—all, says a Hindu writer in *The Modern Review*, 1928, P. 12,—it is incapable of proof. The arguments brought forward for it are invalid.

But from revelation, from God, speaking through the Catholic Church and through Scripture, Catholics know that there is no transmigration of souls. From this source we know more, too, than the fact that transmigration does not exist. For information

as to Catholic belief and teachings concerning the evils of this world the reader is referred to previous questions on original sin and the problem of evil. (*Cf.* pp. 4, 8, 108-112.)

236. What is the Catholic Church's attitude towards evolution?

In one of his many publications on biology, the late Fr. Wasmann, a German Jesuit and evolutionist, uses the following parable to illustrate this question. Two billiard players stand before two tables, on each of which are a hundred balls. A contest is on, in order to see who can pocket all the balls with the least number of shots. One player needs a hundred shots, the other needs only one. Obviously, the second player is the more skillful. In like manner, God appears "more skillful" if He has put the millions of varieties of living beings on this earth with, not millions of "shots", but with one—or at least only a few "shots".

Our question, however, is not one of God's "skillfulness" in doing, but of His very doing, not a question of what He could have done, but of what He *did* do. *Those who assert that He did—or did not—create all the varieties of living beings by creating one—or not many more than one—variety, are under the obligation of proving their assertion.* They do not fulfill this obligation by guessing, by taking refuge in sentences like "this must have happened" or "it would seem that such and such happened", etc. Hypotheses—the scientific name for guesses wise and otherwise—are not proofs.

After these preliminaries let us come to the hypothesis of the one "shot",—or at least not many more than one—namely, evolution. Our first step will be to divide the hypothesis into evolution by chance (Darwinism) and evolution by design (rational evolution).

Darwinism or chance-evolution is the guess that there was at first only one variety of living being—or at any rate not many varieties—, and that in the course of æons chance variations in individuals led by the survival of the fittest to the development of new varieties and species.¹ This guess is now

(1) Darwinism, in the extreme form popularized by Haeckel extends chance-evolution far beyond the origin of life, and *guesses* that "fortuitous concourses of atoms" (*Cf.* p. 1) explain the existence of everything from solar systems to Shakespeare. The familiar theories of the gaseous origin of the universe cause no dismay or discomfort to Catholics provided the irrational elements of change is omitted. Nor are Catholics disturbed by the hypothesis of abiogenesis—the evolution of life from non-life.

widely rejected by the serious scientific world—though not as yet by the pseudo-scientific world of newspapers innumerable—and, of course, by Catholics. I say “of course”, because Catholics, being taught to rely on reason, reject an irrational explanation like mere chance, an explanation that tells *why* something happened by saying that it just happened to happen.¹

Our next concern is with rational evolution, evolution by design, evolution directed by intelligence, that is, by the Intelligence behind the world, God. Such evolution is, let us not forget, a hypothesis, a more or less shrewed guess, not an ascertained fact. Catholics, along with non-Catholics, may (and many do) adopt this guess. There is, however, one reservation to make in the last sentence. For rational evolution—like chance-evolution—is invoked to explain the origin of (a) non-human living beings, and (b) human living beings. Taking (b) first, here is the Catholic position:—The *divinely-founded*

For, if the *primaeval* crossing of the *essential* gulf between non-life and life was the origin of life, then the crossing was due to some inherent property in non-living matter planted there by the Creator.

(1) Orthodox Darwinism, being chance-evolution, makes chance the explanation for favourable variations in “the fittest”. This of course applies first of all to the first favourably varied individual. Its offspring were then supposed to inherit the favourable variations which it chanced to acquire. Unfortunately for this supposition, however, scientists now know something that every mother who had false teeth or dyed hair always knew, namely, that her baby would not be born with false teeth or dyed hair. In other words, that acquired characteristics are not inherited. Again, given an individual with (chance-formed) favourable variations, it requires—at least in the case of innumerable varieties of living beings—a mate, and the (chance-found) mate must also chance to have the same favourable variations, else the offspring will not inherit them to the fullest. Still again, there is a complexity of characteristics needed to make “the fittest” really fit. For instance, if certain individual animals chance to start developing longer necks that enable them to survive famines by eating leaves of trees, chance has to provide much more than longer necks. The fore legs must (by chance) lengthen, else the animal will topple over; the hind legs must (by chance) shorten for the same reason; special neck and shoulder muscles must (by chance) develop in order to hold the neck up, etc. The three arguments against chance-evolution hinted at in this note, together with two others—namely, the geological record, and the non-utility of intermediate evolutionary forms—are lucidly propounded in Belloc’s *A Companion to Mr. Well’s Outline of History* and Lunn’s *The Flight from Reason*. The latter book was written a year or two before Mr. Lunn became a Catholic. For information on alleged “missing links” like *Pithecanthropus* and others, see *So This is Evolution* and *Human Science and Evolution* by Fr. Lebuffe.

-and-guaranteed Church teaches that Adam and Eve were the progenitors of the whole human race. They were created by God, for His glory, in the beginning of time, by two separate acts of creation. Eve, mother of all mankind, was created when "God cast a deep sleep upon Adam; and when he was fast asleep, He took one of his ribs and filled up flesh for it. And the Lord God built the rib which He took from Adam into a woman" (Gen. ii. 21,22). There is, therefore, no question of Eve having evolved from some animal or other. Adam was "formed of the slime of the earth" (Gen. ii. 7),—a statement that just possibly may mean that his body evolved from an animal. The Church has never made a final declaration on this matter, hence I have used the words "just possibly", words that are a far cry from anything like a confident assertion of a proven fact. For one thing, the creation of Adam is a fact, and facts are proved by evidence, not by guesses. Again, the natural—and commonly-accepted—meaning of the words "formed of the slime of the earth" hardly seems to be an assertion that Adam's body evolved from an animal. Further, it is the teaching of the *God-founded-and-guaranteed* Church that all mankind descends from Adam. If, then, his body was the culmination of an aeon-long evolution of animals towards manhood, why did that culmination occur only in one individuals?

So much for the body of Adam, which "just possibly" may have evolved from an animal; as regards his soul having similarly evolved, the question cannot be raised. For, whereas the bodies of a man and of an animal are only accidentally different, different in number, size and arrangement of limbs and organs, their souls are *essentially* different, different with the kind of difference which there is between my hat and myself. (Cf. p. 10).

Our question is now narrowed down to the hypothesis of the evolution of non-human living beings. As long as the hypothesis pertains to rational evolution, and not to mere chance-evolution, Catholics may adopt the guess, if it so please them. The Church is no more interested in this matter than it is interested in Catholics adopting (or not adopting) Pascal's hypothesis that if the nose of Cleopatra had been longer, then the face of the world would have been changed.

237. Is it not wrong to eat meat, especially pork and beef? Is not the soul in all living things the same? And therefore, is it not, wrong to take the life of any animal?

The Catholic Church recognizes no defilement from any

kind of food. The divine principle against eating flesh applies under the Jewish law but has been abolished by God. (Lev. 17-18). No food can defile the soul, but, as Christ teaches, defilement takes place through sin, which alone can harm the soul. (Mark vii. 14-23).

It is no accepted principle of ethics that one is always free to do anything that has not been proved to be wrong. There, therefore, who would prevent others from eating meat must prove that it is wrong. This they cannot do. On the contrary, there are various good reasons for holding that the killing of animals and the eating of meat is allowable. The one best revelation we have here. The words which come from the New Testament, and from the Old (Gen. 1. 29-30) provide the Christian with an argument that it is permissible to eat meat. Again, there is the example of Christ himself who partook of the paschal lamb (Mark xiv. 12-14, Cf. Matthew 26. 17-19).

Apart from this revelation, sound reason can show that human consumption of meat must have been intended by the creator, for all men have stomachs which, unlike those of many animals, can digest meat. The microscope has, moreover, revealed the fact that all men live, as a matter of fact, consume and kill millions upon millions of minute living beings along with even the water they drink. Thus, the taking of animal life can not be intrinsically wrong, for it is a necessity of nature. Finally, there are vast regions in the far north where men must either kill animals for food or starve to death. Men there find it impossible to live otherwise than by taking the lives of bears, reindeers, seals, fishes etc. Thus there appears no cogent reason against eating animal flesh, as there usually is one against eating human flesh. Cannibalism is a violation of the reverence one owes to man, who is the masterpiece of God and a brother.

In certain places and among certain peoples there are peculiar prejudices against eating certain kinds of flesh. The American will not eat that of the horse, since he has a sentimental regard for this animal similar to that entertained by the Hindu for the cow. In both cases the cause is the same, these animals are familiar to the inhabitants of the respective countries, since they work with them daily. The common sense of mankind recognizes that this taboo arises from sentiment, and does not condemn these peoples for not eating the flesh of these animals as long as they recognize that their abstinence is based on sentiment and not on any divine or philosophical prohibition. The veneration paid in some lands to certain animals

such as cats, snakes and crocodiles, is mere superstition, which disappears with enlightenment.

The Catholic Church *does not oblige* her children to eat any meat whatsoever. Some may abstain, and do, for sentimental reasons; some, especially in hot climes, for reasons of health; some, out of a poetical love of all creatures, such as St. Francis of Assissi had; and finally, some, out of a motive of self-denial, the better to chastise the flesh and to overcome the disorderly tendencies of one's nature. The Catholic Church *forbids* the eating of flesh meat on certain days, as for instance, the Fridays of the year—in memory of the death of Christ on a Friday. Monks and Nuns of various religious orders of the Catholic Church often have vows not to eat meat at any time.

There are some who hold the erroneous notion that the principle of life in every living being is the same soul, *Atma*. Those who condemn the eating of meat from this erroneous notion should logically forbid the consumption of even vegetables and fruits and cereals. This, of course, they do not dream of doing. For the nature of the soul the reader is referred to page 8.—See also the remarks on pantheism and on vivisection. (*Cf.* pp. 4, 202).

238. Is intoxicating drink forbidden ?

Intoxication is a *voluntary* excess in drink, from motives of pleasure, to the extent of deprivation of the use of the reason. If it is what moralists call 'perfect'—the state of being 'dead drunk'—, it is *ordinarily* a serious, mortal sin, for it is a grave disorder if one *for mere pleasure* deprive himself not only of the use of reason but also of the possibility of shortly recovering its use. If intoxication is "imperfect", it is ordinarily a venial, lesser, sin though by reason of scandal, damage to others, etc., it may be serious, mortal.

Apart from inducing intoxication itself, is the use of intoxicating liquors forbidden? I answer with the famous principle which St. Ignatius puts into the "Foundation" of his *Spiritual Exercises*. "We must use creatures inasmuch as they lead us to the end for which we are created, and inasmuch as they withdraw us from that end, refrain from them." If, then, liquor is an occasion or cause of sin or harm, it is not to be used. If it is not, if, on the contrary, it helps one to be, say, more of an innocently pleasant companion, then one has in this usefulness a good reason for its occasional use. Of course, there may be even here other reasons against this, *v.g.*, a pledge, a vow—many Catholics and others take such—not to touch liquor,

scandal to others, a just debt to which money spent on drink should rather have gone, etc.

Is intoxicating liquor forbidden? At times and under some circumstances, yes. But always?—Christ did not think so. All but downright haters consider Him a model of holiness, and yet his first miracle was to change water into wine (John ii. 1-11). And at least at the yearly paschal feasts of the Jews He must have, following the God-given rite of the Jews, partaken of wine.

Call sin sin, but spare an already sufficiently sin-beset mankind, and do not invent sins. Call drunkenness sin, but do not say that all drinking is sin. Do not imitate the American Methodists, to whose six million members the recent Prohibition Amendment to the U. S. A. Constitution was, in the popular opinion, largely due—and yet behold how they shut their eyes to the sin of divorce and subsequent re-marriage which is forbidden in the Gospel of St. Mark (ii. 1-12)! Behold, too, how they call all drinking sinful, and yet permit that which God himself called a "detestable thing," unnatural birth control! (Cf. Genesis, xxxviii. 9-10 and the recent Encyclical on Christian marriage by Pope Pius XI).

239. Is it not true that Christ spent some years studying religion in India or Tibet?

The whole of the known life and teachings of Christ is very decidedly against any supposition that He borrowed from Hindu or Buddhist sources. This will be clear to any one who makes an adequate study of the Gospels. Rather, as it has often been suggested, there is a possibility that mediaeval Hinduism and Lamaistic Buddhism has borrowed from Christian sources.

There is not a shred of real evidence that Christ spent the years of what is called His hidden life (from twelve to thirty, approximately) outside His native land. Notovitch once did claim that the Chief Lama of the monastery of Himis in Tibet read to him a life of 'Issa', said to have been translated from Pali into Tibetan, in which it was recorded that Christ left His country at the age of thirteen and spent many years studying Buddhism in India. Several attempts were made to verify this statement. At the request of Max Muller, Professor J. A. Douglas made an investigation in 1895. When he related Notovitch's statement, the Chief Lama exclaimed indignantly, "Lies, lies, nothing but lies!"

The Notovitch incident is thus summed up in a footnote by Hopkins—he did not deem it sufficiently important to give it

fuller notice. "The romance of a Russian traveller's late 'discovery', which Sanskrit scholars estimate at its true value, but which may seem to others worthy of regard, is perhaps, in view of the interest taken in it, one that should be told correctly. Nicholas Notovitch asserts that he discovered seven years ago (1887) in the Tibetan monastery of Himis a work which purports to give a life of Christ from birth to death, including sixteen years spent in India. This life of 'Issa' (Jesus) is declared to have been written in the first century of the Christian era. Unfortunately for the finder, he made a mistake in exploiting his discovery, and stated that his manuscript had been translated for him by the monks of Himis 'out of the original Pali', a dialect that these monks could not understand if they had specimens of it before them. This settled Notovitch's case, and since, of course, he did not transcribe a word of the MS. thus freely put at his disposal, but published the forgery in a French "translation", he may be added to the list of other impostors of his ilk. The humbug has been exposed for some time, and we know of no one who, having a right to express an opinion, believes Notovitch's tale, though some ignorant people have been hoaxed by it." (*The Religions of India*. pp. 545-46).

240. It is not true that the Christian Gospels are based upon the older religion of Buddhism?

It is most illogical to assume that resemblances always imply dependence. As Professor Rhys Davids put it, "It would, of course, be going too far to deny that coincidences of belief are occasionally produced by actual contact of mind with mind; but it is no more necessary to assume that they always are so, than to assume that chalk cliffs, if there be such in China, are produced by chalk cliffs in the Downs of Sussex. They have no connection with one another, except that both are the result of a similar cause. Yet this manner of reasoning is constantly found." (*The Origin and Growth of Religion*, pp. 3-4).

A more recent work, *Buddhism* (London, 1934) by Professor de la Valle Poussin, avoids this faulty reasoning of which Professor Rhys Davids complained. "There are scholars," it tells us, "who believe, from the point of view of scientific method, that Palestine must be explained by Palestine, India by India, and who are *not prepared to admit borrowing and influence without the most cogent reasons* . . . Such cogent reasons occur sometimes: for instance, everyone admits that the story of the Catholic saints, Barlaam and Joasaph, is clearly a re-cast of the legend

of the Resurrection. But substantial proofs of borrowing are lacking in the great majority of cases, and, one may say, in all the cases of importance or interest. The "prudent" scholar when he reads in the Apocryphal Books of Egypt the story of the Divine Child led to the school and hence acquainted with the lesson than the master himself—a story to be found in the *Ishtar-nama*—will promptly say that parallel themes (a divine child) cannot but give birth to parallel details...

The West was for centuries in relation with India. It is true that the influence of the Near East and Iran on India is much better attested than the influence vice versa; that while Buddhism, starting from the East, conquered Upper Asia and China, it did not visibly penetrate Persia and the Aramaic world. But it would not be safe to maintain that it has not enriched the spirituality of Iran with certain ideals, namely, with the ideal of the religious or combative life. It is more "prudent" to believe that such was the fact. There were Buddhist Parthians who translated Indian books into Chinese: is it impossible that Parthians brought Buddhist ideals into the Near East? Let us say rather that it is possible, probable even, if not certain.

But the substantial point of the problem is whether there is something in the old Christian tradition (Gospels, including the Gospels of Infancy and the Apocryphal Literature) which sounds Buddhist or Indian? When one considers the possible borrowing of Iranian data by Buddhism, one is struck by the Iranian character of Amida (who is a Buddhisized Sun: and we know that there has been an Iranian cult of the Sun in North-West India), of Maitreya (a Saviour, like Zoroastrian-Sosyants), and the views of J. Paryushthi have their justification in this Iranian character. The parallels of which Seydel, van Hisinga, or Edmunds have made so much—losing all self-control in the point of believing in the actual translation of Buddhist Pali Texts in St. Luke—are interesting, but they do not betray the actual presence of any specifically Buddhist theme.

With regard to the question of the influence of Christianity on Old India and Buddhism, I think this is not probable. Chronology forbids the hypothesis of an influence on Early Buddhism (Hinayana). But the dogmatic relations between some aspects of Mahayana and Christianity are certainly worthy of remark, and show the "pre-established harmony" between Revelation and human needs: they can and, in my opinion, must be explained by independent evolution... There is, of course, between the Buddhist parallels to the Christian doctrines of the Trinity, the Redemption, and the Christian doctrines

themselves, all the differences which appear between the Avatâras ('Descents') of Vishnu and the Incarnation." (pp. 28-30).

The question of the relationship or non-relationship of Old Buddhism and Christianity is not merely a matter of "parallels". *There are differences to be considered as well.* For Buddhism differs from Christianity in not recognizing man's dependence upon an Infinitely Loving God; in making salvation rest solely on personal effort; in its lack of the strong Christian motives for right conduct; in its belief in a blind, unreasoning, unfree Karma, working itself out by re-incarnations; in its utter pessimism, which declares every form of conscious existence an evil; in its promise of the unconscious repose of Nirvana, with no place for the Christian hope and joy in the eternal reward of heaven,—a reward which is the knowing and loving of God everlasting and in a sublimely ineffable manner!

241. I am scandalized on account of Christ's unseemly anger against the fig tree. (Mark xi. 12-14).

The passage reads: "And the next day when they came out of Bethania He was hungry. And when He had seen afar off a fig tree having leaves, He came if perhaps He might find anything on it. And when He was come to it, He found nothing but leaves. For it was not the time for figs. And answering, He said to it, 'May no man hereafter eat fruit of thee any more forever.' And the disciples heard it . . . And when evening was come, He went forth out of the city. And when they passed by in the morning, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. And Peter remembering said to Him, 'Rabbi, behold the fig tree which Thou didst curse is withered away'". (Mark, xi. 12-14, 19-21).

In the third volume of his scholarly *Life of Christ* the veteran Fr. Fillion wrote: "Such an anathema against a soulless being would be hard to explain, especially coming from our Lord, if it were not for the fact that it contains a striking symbol. But all becomes clear if, with Bossuet—following Origen and St. Jerome and most early and modern commentators, we reflect that 'it is a parable, not in words, but in things', like the parable we find verbally expressed in St. Luke xiii. 6.

"A resemblance is evident between the parable of the fig tree, quoted above, and the anathema just cited, for in both cases we have the same thought: the threat of punishment directed against a barren tree; with this difference, however, that in the parable the threat is conditional, while in the present case it is absolute. Moreover, the fig tree obviously is not threatened or punished on its own account, since it could not be held accountable for its

barrenness. In both texts, the tree symbolically stands for the Jewish nation. For many centuries that nation had received a great abundance of divine favours . . . yet, through its own fault, it was unfortunately destitute of fruits or merits, and concealed the emptiness and even malice of its works beneath fine appearances. The divine Husbandman, therefore, by this expressive figure, declares that He will strike it with the axe." (p. 252).

"This miracle is the only one of its kind in our Lord's life, and the critics are not the first to be astonished at it. St. Augustine says: 'What had the tree done? What was the tree's fault?' Following the usual interpretation of Christian exegetes, we must look beyond the tree and see in Christ's act a symbol. . . The fig tree was cursed, not only because it was barren, but also because it was an emblem of hypocrisy and falsehood. Since, considering the usual conditions of its fruit-bearing, its abundant foliage seemed to indicate that it was well laden with fruit. In so far as it was a symbol of the moral and religious conduct of the Jewish people, this tree was a deceiver and for that reason was condemned, like those whom it typified. But it is gratuitously unjust to accuse the divine Master of giving way to anger and vengeance on this occasion." (p. 639).

242. If Christ's coming unto the world was so necessary, why did he wait so long?

Since He did not tell us, we are left to our own surmises, based on the things He did tell us. Thus we know (1) that no one at any time or in any place has ever been or ever will be denied a sufficiency of God's grace for him or her to escape hell. (2) This grace has been and will ever be given through the meriting of Jesus Christ, and not because of—but rather in spite of, or in completion of—the individual's non-Catholic religion. (3) God sincerely desires that all attain the Beatific Vision in heaven's unending bliss. (4) At least to all who have the use of reason sufficient grace is given for this. (5) For those who die without having attained the use of reason and have not received Baptism or, before Baptism existed, the corresponding rites of Judaism, God reserves an everlasting natural happiness in a manner known to Him alone. (6) Many of those who do attain to the Beatific Vision may, in all probability, be those who, while on earth, regarded themselves, and were regarded by others, as non Catholics or non-Christians, but who in reality were Catholics—at least, at the moment of death—by reason of their explicit or implicit desire sincerely to do *all* that God required of them

and to repent sincerely for their conscious falling short of these requirements. (*Cf.* pp. 105, 106, 215, 230).

We may add that God's providence varies with man's various circumstances, for God, as Supreme Justice, well knows that "circumstances alter cases." The meaning is here two-fold. First, that those to whom has been given a sufficient knowledge of God's Church can be saved only by acting sincerely on that knowledge, by entering that Church and by living up to its teachings. Secondly, those who, through no fault of their own, have had no sufficient knowledge of the Church are saved if they have sincerely followed their conscience and used the grace God has given them to that end. At the Judgment seat of Christ one may plead ignorance of the law, but not insincerity. For to be ignorant of Christ's law is not to be insincere, unless that ignorance is wilful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Collections

Catholic Encyclopedia. 15 volumes, over 10,000 pages.

Treasury of the Faith Series. 36 one-shilling volumes on Catholicism in its teaching.

Calvert Series. 24 one-dollar books on Catholicism in its relations with the modern world.

Cambridge Summer School Studies. 12 volumes on Catholic teaching. A new volume is published every year.

Heythrop Theological Studies. More advanced account of Catholic teaching.

Science and Culture Series. 30 volumes on Catholicism and Science and Culture. Two new volumes a year.

Religion and Culture Series. 5 volumes on the inner life of Catholicism. One or two new volumes a year.

Essays in Order. 15 one-shilling volumes in interpretation of our times in the light of Catholic teaching.

Catholic Book a Month Club Series. 60 volumes now (1 June, 1935) published in London and 54 others in New York. Essays, Fiction, Biography by Chesterton, Belloc, Noyes, Shiela Kaye-Smith, Martindale, Ronald Knox, Sigrid Undset, Jorgensen, Papini and other famous Catholic authors.

Popular Exposition of Catholicism

Martindale. *Jack, Jock and the Corporal.* A war novel. *The Faith of the Roman Church.* The two are the best of his forty books.

Lunn. *Now I See.* Arnold Lunn, formerly without religion, tells why he became a Catholic.

Johnson, Father Vernon. *One Lord and One Faith.* Why a famous Anglican preacher became a Catholic.

Stoddard. *Rebuilding a Lost Faith.* He sold 5,000,000 copies of the books he wrote during the fifty years he was an agnostic. Here he tells why he became a Catholic, and in his *Twelve Years After* he tells why he remains one.

D'Arcy. *Life of the Church.* A "best seller" in French and now in English.

Dandoy. *What is Catholicism?* Answered in the light of the Vedānta.

Adams. *The Spirit of Catholicism.* Vies with *Life of the Church* as one of the best brief studies of the Church.

Philosophical

- Brosnan. *God and Reason; God Infinite and Reason*. Two popular expositions of how a Catholic reasons about God.
- Mercier, Cardinal. *Scholastic Philosophy*. Two 750 page volumes by the philosopher-patriot-priest of Louvain, Belgium.
- Sheen. *God and Intelligence*. The best work of a voluminous author who has read all the modern philosophers.
- Stonyhurst Philosophical Series*. 8 volumes on logic, metaphysics, psychology, ethics, political economy and theodicy.

Catholicism and Science

- Noyes. *The Unknown God*. The Epic Poet of Science takes you through Darwin, Huxley, Spencer to their fulfilment.
- Sheen. *The Philosophy of Science*. Deals with Jeans in the light of Aristotle, and with both in the light of Aquinas.
- Walsh. *Popes and Science*. Chapters in the history of the help science has received at the hands of the Popes. *Twelve Catholic Men of Science*. Pasteur, Mendel, Copernicus, and others.
- Windle. *Church and Science*. By a scientist who found his way to the Church, and wrote with a knowledge of both.

Historical

- Grisar. *Martin Luther*. 5 volume history of the Father of Protestantism as revealed in his writings. *History of the Popes*. 3 large folio volumes on the first five centuries.
- Mann. *History of the Popes*. 18 volumes, dealing with the 6th to the 14th centuries.
- Pastor. *History of the Popes*. 24 volumes issued (1 June, 1935). A further 16 will be translated from the German, then we shall have 40 scholarly volumes, from the 14th to the end of the 18th century.
- Mourret. *History of the Church*. 12 French volumes now being translated. Several have already appeared.
- Laux. *History of the Church*. Brief popular one volume account.
- Hughes. *History of the Church*. To be completed in 3 volumes; two are now published.
- Belloc. *Europe and the Faith*. Account of the Catholic contribution to European culture. *How the Reformation Happened*. Frank, critical, readable and not "official". A Companion to Mr. Wells' "Outline of History."

Sociology

- Ross. *Sociology*. An American Catholic College textbook.
- Husslein. *Christian Social Manifesto*. Clear account of the social teachings of two Popes, 1891 and 1931.

Ryan. *Living Wage*. Meaning and justification. *Distributive Justice*. Closely reasoned theory of justice in distribution of wealth. *Socialism, Promise or Menace?* Dr. Ryan is co-author with Morris Hillquit. The book is their famous public debate on Socialism, both sides ably presented by expert and cautious debaters.

Belloc. *Servile State*. Some say this indictment of Capitalism is his best book. *Economics for Helen*. Helen, Junior Cambridge, will understand this book and Helen, Ph. D., D. Litt., will want to reread it.

Martindale. *Father Plater*. Inspiring account of what a man can do for practical sociology.

Bible.

Pope. *Students' Aids to the Bible*. 5 able volumes. *Layman's New Testament*. Text and annotations.

Fillion. *Life of Christ*. 3 huge volumes written at the end of fifty years of study and authorship.

Lebreton. *Life of Christ*. 2 volumes by one of the two greatest living French scriptural students. Best Life of Christ.

Grandmaison. *Jesus Christ*. Sources, Person and Message of Christ. Represents, in 3 volumes, fifty years of research.

Felder. *Christ and the Critics*. 2 large volumes on Strauss, Renan, Harnack, Loisy and such hostile critics.

Adams. *Christ Our Brother*. Several editions in each of several languages have appeared of this study of the human Christ. *Son of God*. The same applies to this study of the Divine Christ.

Asceticism, Mysticism.

Poulain. *Graces of Interior Prayer*. The standard study on Mysticism, a much translated book.

Charles. *Prayer for All Times*. Also much translated.

St. Teresa. *The Interior Castle*. Masterpiece of the greatest Catholic mystic writer.

St. John of the Cross. *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*. Unless we say the same for this, too.

St. Francis of Sales. *Introduction to a Devout Life*. A most beloved book by a most beloved Saint.

Raymond Lull. *Book of the Belover and the Beloved*. A much admired book by a great lover of God.

Thomas A'Kempis. *Imitation of Christ*. This famous 14th century book has been translated into most languages.

St. Thérèse of Lisieux. *Autobiography*. The "little way" of the "Little Flower of Jesus" has inspired readers in over a hundred languages, including Bengali, Tamil, Malayalam.

Martindale. *What are Saints?* B.B.C. radio talks that have often been reprinted.

Goodier. *The Inner Life of a Catholic*. The first book to be read in this section.

Faber. *All for Jesus and Growth in Holiness*. The best of his spiritual books.

Sheed & Ward. *The English Way*. Brief lives of English Saints and other holy persons.

Sheed & Ward. *The Irish Way*. Ditto for Ireland.

Lunn. *A Saint in the Slave Trade*. The Church and Slavery.

Comparative Religion

Studies in Comparative Religion. 40 pamphlets by various authors, issued by the Catholic Truth Society, London. Available separately or in 5 bound volumes.

Schmidt. *The Origin and Growth of Religion*. The veteran and scholarly editor of *Anthropos* (Vienna) gives in these lectures a foretaste of the six huge German tomes on Comparative Religion he is now preparing.

Pamphlets.

Several thousand inexpensive pamphlets on various matters connected with Catholicism and theology, philosophy, morality, asceticism, mysticism, history, science, art, literature, etc. published by :

Indian Catholic Truth Society (I.C.T.S.), Trichinopoly, India.

Light of the East, 30 Park Street, Calcutta, India.

Catholic Truth Society, (C.T.S.), 28a, Ashley Place, London, S. W. 1.

Catholic Social Guild (C.S.G.), Oxford.

America Press, 461, 8th Ave., New York.

Paulist Press, 401 W, 59th St., New York.

Queen's Work Press. 3742 W. Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Mo., (U.S.A.)

GENERAL INDEX

A

- Abercius, Epitaph of, 88.
- Act of Supremacy, Elizabeth's, 81.
Uniformity, " , 82.
- Age of the human race, 45.
- Aionios*, 186.
- Alexander VI, Pope, 92.
- Allegiance, Catholics and civil, 226.
- Anathema, 101.
- Anglican Church, origin, 80.
not Catholic, 73.
branch theory, 51, 78.
continuity, 78.
- Anglican orders, 151.
- Animals, cruelty to, 202.
- Annulments, 163.
- Antiquity of man, 45.
- Apocrypha, 40, 192.
- Apocryphal Gospels, 27.
- Apostles not all equal, 84.
- Apostolicity of the Church, 76.
- Arianism, 64.
- Articles, the Forty-two, 81.
the Thirty-nine, 82.
- Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, 173
- Astrology, 195.
- Atonement, doctrine of, 37.
is it unjust ?, 39.
- Attendance at non-Catholic services,
108.
- Authenticity of the Vulgate, 43.
- Baptism, 58, 117.
by non-Catholics, 117.
by immersion, 117.
clinical, 118.
conditional, 120.
of Desire and of Blood, 119.
necessity of, 107, 119, 211.
infants dying without, 119.
of infants, 119.
and Christian names, 120.

B

- Baptismal controversy, the, 89, 117.
- Believe, why men do not, 59.

- Bible, inspiration of, 41.
criteria of inspiration of, 42.
inerrancy of, 42.
not sole rule of Faith, 47.
and Tradition, 47.
in the Middle Ages, 50.
of Luther, 50.
translations of, 50.
reading of, 51.
chained, 52.
- Birth control, 165.
- Bishop and Presbyter in the New
Testament, 151.
- Bismarck and censorship, 102.
- Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, 168.
virginity of, 169.
Immaculate Conception of, 171.
Assumption of, 173.
not adored, 173.
sinlessness of, 173.
devotion to, 174, 176.
- Boniface VIII and dissection, 66.
- Book of Common Prayer, 80, 82.
- Branch theory, 61, 78.
- Brethren of Jesus, 169.
- British Church and Rome, 78.
- Buddhism and Gospels, 239.
- Burial, Christian, 103.

C

- Calixtus III and Halley's Comet, 67.
- Canon of the Bible, 40
- Capital punishment, 201.
- Capitalism, 199, 223.
- Caste system, 228.
- Casuitry, 205.
- Catacombs, 178, 192.
- Catherine de Medicis and St. Bartholo-
mew's Day, 98.
- Catholic and Protestant nations
compared, 72.
- Catholic, the first use of the name, 74.
- Catholicity of the Church, 73.
- Catholics, number in the world, 74.
- Celibacy of the clergy, 153.
not impossible or unnatural, 155.
does not belittle marriage, 156.

- Charity, the bond of, 67.
 Charlemagne and the Saxons, 95.
 Christ, the Divinity of, 28.
 in the Synoptics, 31.
 in St. John, 34.
 ignorance of, 209.
 in Tibet, 238.
 and the fig tree, 241.
 the delay in the coming of, 242.
 Christian lands, wicked, 216.
 morality inferior, 221.
 science, 17.
 Christians becoming Hindus etc., 221.
 Christianity dying out in the West, 219.
 Church and Bible, 51.
 and education, 105, 157.
 and evolution, 233.
 and personal religion, 58.
 and reason, 57, 229, 233.
 and science, 65, 66, 67, 93, 233.
 and the caste system, 228.
 and the Reformation, 53.
 and the State, 104, 204, 207, 226.
 and the Vedanta, 233.
 and union with God, 58.
 Apostolicity of, 76.
 Catholicity of, 73.
 infallibility of, 56.
 holiness of, 69, 216, 217.
 not a despotism, 57.
 number of adherents, 75.
 perpetuity of, 53.
 unity of, 59, 67.
 the Eastern Orthodox, 61, 62.
 why non-Catholics do not join, 59.
 wicked members of, 71, 216.
 Churches, cost of, 222.
 Comet, Halley's, 67.
 Commandments, the Ten, 195.
 Common Prayer Book of, 80, 82.
 Communion, 121.
 under one kind, 128.
 of Saints, 191, 196.
 Communism, in the Bible, 198.
 of the Fathers, 199.
 Comprehensiveness, 61.
 Conception, the Immaculate, 172.
 Confession, and John xx., 137.
 and the Council of Lateran, 137.
 the Fathers on, 138.
 in the Eastern Orthodox Church, 138.
 and the power of Priests, 140.
 does not corrupt the mind, 141.
 the secret of, 141, 208, 209.
 does not weaken character, 142.
 not an incentive to sin, 142.
 not degrading, 142.
 Confirmation, the Sacrament of, 120.
 Converts, levity of, 212.
 purchased, 220.
 right to make, 221.
 Conscience, 6, 227.
 Continuity theory, 78.
 Contract, freedom of, 223.
 Cranmer, 81.
 Creation, 4, 8, 44.
 the six days of, 44.
 Creed, the Apostles', 182, 183.
 the Athanasian, 28, 182, 183.
 the Nicene 182, 183.
 Cremation, 103.
 Cross, the Sign of the, 167.
 relics of the, 180.
 Cures of Christian Science, 17.
 Cyprian, St., and Pope St. Stephen, 89, 117.
- ### D
- Descent of man, 11, 233.
 Design, the Argument from, 1.
 Determinism, 14.
 Deutero-canonical books, 40.
 Development of doctrine, 65.
 Devil, the, 109, 184.
 Dissection and Pope Boniface VIII, 66.
 Dissolution of the English Monasteries, 158.
 Divinity of Christ, 28, 31, 34.
 Divorce, 160.
 Dogmas of Hinduism, 232.
 Drink, intoxicating, 237.
- ### E
- Easter, the controversy over, 88.
 Education and the Church, 104, 157, 207.
 End, a good does not justify a bad means, 210.

Episcopacy, 150.
 Equivocation, 208.
 Eucharist, the Holy, 121.
 in St. John, 121, 124.
 in the Fathers, 123, 133.
 in the Gospels and St. Paul,
 121-26, 128, 130.
 objections against, 121-26.
 Eugenics and the Church, 202.
 Evil, the Problem of, 8.
 Evolution, 11, 45, 65, 233.
 Excommunication, 101.
 Extreme Unction, 145-47.

F

Faith, hindrances to, 20, 21, 59.
 and reason, 20, 110, 111, 234.
 nature of, 20, 21.
 necessity of, 107, 112.
 alone does not justify, 112.
 Fall, the doctrine of the, 108.
 Fig tree cursed by Christ, 241.
 Favouritism to the West, God's, 221.
 Flesh and Spirit in the New Testa-
 ment, 124.
 Foreknowledge of God and Hell, 188.
 Freedom of thought, 56, 58.
 Freemasonry, 103.
 Free Will, 13, 194, 201, 217.
 Fundamental and non-fundamental
 doctrines, 67.

G

Galileo, condemnation of, 93.
 Gandhi, 213, 217.
 Gita and religious changes, 212.
 God, 6, 24, 111, 193, 221.
 wills all to be saved, 4, 177, 188,
 242.
 Good works, 112.
 Gospels, authentic, 26.
 and Buddhism, 239.
 Gregory XII, and St. Bartholomew's
 Day, 98.
 Grosseteste, Bishop and Papal Supre-
 macy, 79.
 Great Western Schism, 67.

H

Halley's Comet, 67.
 Heaven, 189, 190, 217.
 Hell, 185-190.

Henry VIII and the English Monas-
 teries, 79, 158.
 divorce of, 79.
 Holiness of the Church, 53, 69, 71,
 216, 217.
 Holy Water, 167.
 Huguenots, the massacre of the, 96,
 99.

I

Idolatry, 229.
 Images and pictures, 178.
 Immaculate Conception, the, 171.
 Immersion, Baptism by, 117.
 Immortality of the soul, 10, 14.
 Implicit quotations in the Bible, 43.
 Incarnation, the, 28, 242.
 Index, the Roman, 102.
 Indian Christians, 214.
 India's religions suffice, 213.
 Indifferentism, 16.
 not in the Bible, 19.
 Indulgences, 143-45, 193.
 Inerrancy of the Bible, 42.
 Infallibility of the Church, 54.
 of the Pope, 84, 91.
 and impeccability, 92.
 Inquisition, 96.
 Inspiration of the Bible, 41, 42.
 Intolerance, the charge of, 98.
 of the Reformers, 98.
 Intoxicating drink, 237.

J

Jacobites, 63.
 Jesuits, the morals of, 210.
 and compulsory converts, 214.
 Jesus Christ, the Messiah, 29.
 the Divinity of, 31-36.
 the One Mediator, 38, 176.
 the Redemption, 37-40.
 in Tibet, 238.
 and the fig tree, 251.
 why born so late, 242.
 Joan of Arc, St., 93.
 Joan, fable of Popess, 90.
 Judgment, Particular and General,
 181, 209, 243.
 Justification, 108.
 by Faith alone, 110.

K

Krishna, 217.

L

- Landgrave of Hesse, the bigamy of, 159, 210.
 Latin in the Mass, 135.
 Vulgate, the, 43.
 Leo XIII, Pope, 199, 200, 22.
 Liberty of thought, 56, 58, 227, 234.
 Limbo, 119.
 Legends of the Saints, 180.
 Living Wage, the, 221.
 Lourdes, miracles at, 23, 24, 180.
 Love of God, 143, 217.
 Lying never lawful, 208.
 Lynching of heretics in the Middle Ages, 97.

M

- Magic, 115, 195.
 Marriage, 158-166.
 Martyrs, the, 18, 70.
 Mary Tudor, 100.
 Mass, 130.
 a true Sacrifice, 130.
 in the Bible, 131.
 in the Fathers, 133.
 not derogatory to the Sacrifice of the Cross, 134.
 and the Souls in Purgatory, 135.
 stipends, 135.
 in Latin, 135.
 obligation of attending, 198.
 Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, The, 99.
 Medals, 195.
 Mental reservation, 208.
 Merit, 112, 210.
 Middle Ages, Bible in the, 50.
 Monks of the, 157.
 Miracles, the, of Christ, 32.
 and the Laws of Nature, 23, 24.
 and an Unchangeable God, 24.
 all religions claim, 25.
 at Lourdes, 23, 24, 180.
 and the Wisdom of God, 24.
 Why do not all Priests perform, 141.
 how proved? 25.
 have not ceased, 23, 24, 180.
 pagan, 25.
 of the Saints, 23, 24, 180.

- Monarchical Episcopate, the, 150.
 Money, for Masses, 135.
 for Churches, 222.
 Monks, Medieval, 157.
 and Nuns, 157.
 Morality inferior, Christian, 217.
 Mortal sin, 229.
 Mysteries in Religion, 20, 22.

N

- Nestorianism, 63, 209.

O

- Orders, Holy, the Sacrament of, 148-153.
 Anglican, invalid, 151.
 Ordinal, the Edwardine, 81, 152.
 Original Sin, 108-112.
 Orthodox Greek Church, 63, 75, 115, 138.
 Ouija-Board, the 197.
 "Outside the Church no Salvation", 105.
 Overpopulation, the Theory of, 165.

P

- Pagans, the Salvation of, 105, 106, 215, 242.
 Pantheism, 4.
 Pascal, and Jesuit moral teaching, 210.
 Paul, St., not married, 154.
 Pauline Privilege, the, 162.
 Penance, The Sacrament of, 136.
 in the Bible, 136.
 in the Early Church, 137.
 Penitential Books, Medieval, 138.
 Persecution, the charge of, 95-100.
 the Reformers on, 98, 100.
 Peter, St., in Rome, 82.
 Bishop of Rom, 82.
 the Primacy of, 84, 87.
 the Rock, 84.
 the Denial of, 92.
 Pilgrimages, 181.
 Pius V, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 99.
 Planchette, the, 197.
 Polygamy, 159.
 Pope, Primacy of, 87-90.
 in the Early Church, 87-90.

fable of a woman, 90.
 Alexander VI, 92.
 Pius XI, 223.
 Calixtus III and Halley's
 Comet, 67.
 Infallibility of, The, 91-95.
 and the Western Schism, 67.
 Popes, wicked, 53, 71, 92.
 Prayer, 193-95.
 does not inform God, 193.
 implies no change in God, 194.
 answers to, 195.
 to the Blessed Virgin and the
 Saints, 173, 174, 177, 179, 181.
 for the Dead, 135, 191.
 Prayers, Primitive Liturgical, 147,
 192.
 Priests, all Christians not, 148.
 Property, private, 198, 199, 223.
 Prosperity, the argument of, 72.
 Protestant, and Catholic countries
 compared, 72.
 services, attendance at, 108.
 Protestants, number of, 75.
 Providence, Divine, 4.
 Public Schools, and the Church, 104.
 Purgatory, 191.
 and Indulgences, 144.
 and the Mass, 135, 191.
 in the Fathers, 192.

R

Real Presence, the, 121, 126, 127.
 Reason, Luther's idea of, 58.
 and Faith, 14, 15, 20, 56, 57,
 110, 185.
 Redemption, the, 37, 39.
 Reformation, the causes of the, 54.
 Relics, 179.
 of the True Cross, 180.
 Religion of India, 212, 213.
 levity of change of, 212.
 one as good as another, 17.
 one's own bad for others, 212.
 origin of, 6, 7.
 Religions, Why so many?, 19.
 Reservation, mental, 208.
 Resurrection of the Body, 182.
 Revelation, necessity of, 15.
 Rivers run to the sea, all, 215.
 Roman Catholic, 75.
 Rosary, the, 176.

Rota, annulments, 163.
 Rule of Faith, the, 46, 49, 76.
 Sabbath, the Jewish, changed, 197.
 Sacramentals, 166-168.
 Sacraments, The, 114-166.
 The idea of, 114-115.
 efficacy of, 115.
 not Magic, 115.
 matter and form of, 115, 145.
 repetition of, 120, 153.
 number of the, 116.
 Divine Institution of, 116, 119,
 120, 121, 136, 145, 148, 158.
 the Minister of the, 117, 121,
 129, 142, 145, 148.

S

Saints, Communion of, 191, 196.
 veneration of the, 117.
 prayers to the, 117.
 miracles of the, 180.
 legends of the, 181.
 Salvation, outside the Church, 105,
 106, 215, 221, 230, 242.
 of Pagans, 105, 106, 221, 230,
 242.
 Satisfaction for Sin, 136, 142.
 Scandals in the Church, 53, 71, 92.
 Scapular, the, 167, 195.
 Schism, the Sin of, 62.
 the Great Western, 67.
 Schismatics, Eastern, 63, 75, 115, 138.
 Schools, Public and the Church, 104.
 Science and the Church, 65, 66, 67,
 93, 233.
 "Search the Scriptures", 47.
 Secrets, natural, intrusted, profes-
 sional, 141, 208.
 Secret of the Confessional, 141, 208,
 209.
 Servile Work, 198.
 Sex Hygiene in the schools, 207.
 Septuagint, the, 40.
 Sheol, 185.
 Sin, Original, 108.
 Sinners in the Church, 53, 71, 92.
 Sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin, 171.
 Six Days of Creation, the, 44.
 Socialism, 198, 199.
 Social Question, the, 223.
 Social Programme, Catholic, 223.
 Soul, the Nature of the, 10.

the animal, 10.
 Have women a ?, 10.
 immortality of the, 14.
 Sovereignty, Popular, 227.
 Spanish Inquisition, The, 95.
 Spiritism, 195.
 Sterilization of the Unfit, the, 204.
 Succession, Apostolic, the, 87.
 Suffering, 8, 39.
 Suicide, the Ethics of, 200.
 Sunday Observance, 197.
 Superstition, 167.
 Support of the Clergy, the, 135.
 Swaraj and the Church, 226.

T

Temporal Prosperity and the
 Church, 72.
 Punishment, 191.
 Tetzel on Indulgences, 143.
 Theosophy, 15.
 Tibet, Christ in, 238.
 Tradition, Divine, 46.
 Transmigration of souls, 230.
 Transubstantiation, 126, 127.
 Trinity, the Blessed, 20, 22.

U

Unity of the Church, the, 59.
 Utilitarianism, 6.

V

Vedanta Philosophy, 229.
 Venial Sin, 192.
 Vicious Circle, the so called, 50.
 Victor, Pope, and the Easter Con-
 troversy, 80.
 Virgin Birth, the, 169.
 objections to, 170, 171.
 not borrowed from Paganism,
 170.
 Vivisection, 202.
 Vulgate, the Latin, 43.

W

Wells, H. G., 220.
 West, God favoured the, 221.
 Wage, the Living, 223.
 War, The morality of, 206.
 Water, Holy, 167.
 Western Schism, the Great, 67.
 Will, Freedom of the, 13.
 Women and the Council of Macon, 10.

THE NEW REVIEW

EDITED AT ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE, CALCUTTA

THOROUGHLY INDIAN IN OUTLOOK

IT HAS A UNIVERSAL APPEAL

MORE THAN 200 QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTORS.

Some Press Opinions

Times Literary Supplement

THE NEW REVIEW has reached a higher level than is often found in monthly publications in India.

Amrita Bazar Patrika

The journal has really struck a new note in the periodical literature in India and has created a new category all its own.

The Hindu

In the present transitional stage of India, a journal which seeks to point out the Catholic way out of the impasse is quite welcome.

The Light of the East

India's Catholics have now a review to be proud of, a review worthy of their culture and, as far as is humanly attainable, of their religion.

America

THE NEW REVIEW ranges over a wide human field, and one near to its readers.

South China Morning Post

The contents and make-up remind one somewhat of 'Chamber's'—the literary standard of THE NEW REVIEW is equally high. . .

Price Re. 1 (or 2s) per copy

Annual Subscription Rs. 12 (Foreign £1)

Apply to the Publishers :

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

294, BOW BAZAR STREET, CALCUTTA

MACMILLAN'S
CATHOLIC PUBLICATIONS

THE KING'S KEYS. By Cecily Hallack. With Illustrations by R. de Souza. 7s. 6d. net.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN ACTION. By M. Williams & J. Kernan. 10s. 6d. net.

THE CATHOLIC SPIRIT IN MODERN ENGLISH LITERATURE. By George N. Shuster. 10s. 6d. net.

AMERICAN JESUITS. By Dr. J. J. Walsh. 10s. 6d. net.

ESSAYS ON NATIONALISM. By Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes. 12s. 6d. net.

SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION. By Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D., 10s. 6d. net.

THE STATE AND THE CHURCH. By Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D. and Rev. M. F. X. Millar, S. J. 12s. 6d. net.

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE. By Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D. 17s. net.

POLITICAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE, in two volumes. By Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes. Vol. I, 15s. net. Vol. II—In the press.

ENGLISH HISTORY, 2 Volumes. By James H. Gense, S. J.
Part I, From the Earliest Times to the Tudor Period (1485)
Part II, Modern English History (1485-1924) Illustrated.
2s. 6d. each.

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF HOLISM. By Monsignor F. C. Kolbe, D. D. A Criticism of the Theory put forward by General Smuts in his Book "Holism and Evolution." With a Foreword by General The Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts. 2s. 6d. net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

CALCUTTA, BOMBAY & MADRAS

